FOREIGN
BROADCAST
INFORMATION
SERVICE

Daily Report

Soviet Union

FBIS-SOV-87-234
Monday
7 December 1987

Daily Report
Soviet Union

FBIS-SOV-87-234 CONTENTS *7 December 1987*

ARMS CONTROL & DISARMAMENT

- Defense Ministry's Shabanov Discusses SDI, ABM *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 5 Dec]* 1
- Deryabin on Eliminating Tactical Nuclear Arms 3
- Tenin Hits 'Dishonest' U.S. Approach to CW Ban *[IZVESTIYA 2 Dec]* 3

WORLDWIDE ISSUES

- Gerasimov on Summit's Effects for Europe *[London ITV]* 6
- Shishlin: 'Uncomfortable' Optimism on Summit *[Prague Television]* 7
- Weekly 'International Observers Roundtable' *[B. Adrianov, N. Agayants, V. Levin]* 8
- 'Top Priority' on Summit Expectations *[P. Kuznetsov, R. Bogdanov, S. Plekhanov]* 12
- UN Official Views Summit as 'Breakthrough' 16
- Kashlev at East-West Seminar in W. Berlin 16
- Ryzhkov Receives UN Population Fund Chief 16

REAGAN-GORBACHEV SUMMIT

- U.S. Government, Citizens Cited on Relations 17
  - Reagan IZVESTIYA Interview *[5 Dec]* 17
  - Network Interview Cited *[5 Dec]* 20
  - Reagan Discusses 'Joint Steps' 21
  - Shultz Supports Treaty 21
  - Further Shultz Comments 21
  - USIA 'Propaganda' 'Nasty' *[Zorin]* 22
  - Further on USIA 22
  - Warnke Interviewed on Prospects 23
  - INF Opponents Cited *[PRAVDA 4 Dec]* 23
  - Presummit Atmosphere *[PRAVDA 5 Dec]* 24
  - Citizens Write to Gorbachev *[PRAVDA 5 Dec]* 26
- Soviet Officials, Commentators Discuss Ties 26
  - Arbatov Discusses Summit *[Athens RIZOSPASTIS 3 Dec]* 26
  - Chervov Interviewed *[East Berlin]* 28
  - Charikov, Kolesnichenko 28
  - Sagdeyev in Washington 31
  - Lukashuk Views Relations 32
  - Caution on 'Wishful Thinking' 32
  - Pozner Assails Right Wing 33
  - Zorin: 'Positive Results' 33
  - Bogdanov: 'Optimism' 34
  - Bogachev on U.S. Violations 34
- Events, Activities Reported, Reviewed 35
  - Disarmament Message Received 35
  - More on 4 Dec News Conference 35
  - Glasnost Addressed 36
  - 5 Dec News Conference 36
  - Further on News Conference 37
  - Soviet, U.S. Polls Compared 37
  - 'Antiwar Action' Planned 38
  - 'Peace Chain' Links in Moscow 38
  - Washington Demonstration 38
  - Moscow 'Mass Meeting' 39
  - Further on 'Demogogues' 39
  - Events Reviewed, Examined *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 4 Dec]* 39

'Irritating' Factors Noted 40
'Zionists' Hold Demonstration 41
Andrianov: 'Nonexistent Issue' 41
Church Delegation to U.S. 42
Patriarch Pimen Urges Prayer 42

INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS

Northeast Asia

Gorbachev Congratulates Japanese CP Head 44
Dmitriyev on Japanese Reaction to INF Treaty 44

Near East & South Asia

Gromyko Receives Iran's Envoy Hayrani-Nobari 44
  Suggests Iran Stop War *[PRAVDA 5 Dec]* 44
  Expanding Relations Stressed *[Tehran]* 46
Danish Tanker Attacked in Gulf, One Killed 46

West Europe

Gorbachev Departs for London, Washington Summit 46
  Sent Off at Vnukovo Airport 46
  Makes Stopover in Britain 47
Moscow Commentaries on Gorbachev-Thatcher Meeting 47
  Station Commentary 47
  Yevgeniy Ivanov Commentary 47
Howe Interviewed on Summit, Soviet Ties *[PRAVDA 7 Dec]* 48
Further on Ligachev Activities in France 49
  Speech Stresses 'Common Cause' *[PRAVDA 5 Dec]* 49
  Addresses Ivry Communists 49
  Holds 4 Dec News Conference 50
  More on Paris News Conference 52
Kondryatev Views FRG Stands on Arms Treaty 53
W. Europe Union Urges Treaty Ratification *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 5 Dec]* 54

Latin America & Caribbean

Wrecking of Haiti Elections Viewed *[Bay in IZVESTIYA 3 Dec]* 55
Gorbachev Greets Mexican Socialist Party Leader 55
Grossu Confers With Mexican Socialist Gallardo *[PRAVDA 2 Dec]* 56
More on Soviet Delegation in Latin America 56
  Received by Venezuelan Congress *[IZVESTIYA 3 Dec]* 56
  Meet With Peru's Garcia 56
RSFSR's Orlov Returns to Moscow From Havana *[IZVESTIYA 2 Dec]* 57
Fidel Castro Receives Rybakov-Led Delegation *[PRAVDA 3 Dec]* 57

NATIONAL AFFAIRS

Political & Social

Central Committee Discusses Restructuring *[PRAVDA 5 Dec]* 58
Government Expresses Thanks for GOSR Greetings 59
Kiev Plenum on Continuing Chernobyl Problems *[SOTSIALISTICHESKAYA INDUSTRIYA 4 Dec]* 59
Ukraine CP CC Commemorates October Jubilee *[PRAVDA UKRAINY 25 Nov]* 60
  Shcherbitskiy Attends *[PRAVDA 28 Nov]* 62
  Shcherbitskiy Speaks *[PRAVDA UKRAINY 28 Nov]* 62
More on Ryzhkov, Zaykov Electronics Visit *[PRAVDA 2 Dec]* 64
Demichev at Construction Industry Session 65

Vorotnikov Ends Visit to Tambov Oblast 65
Prosecutor Interviewed on Drug Addiction 66
Racial 'Conflict' at Azerbaijani School *[KOMOSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA 1 Dec]* 66
Bribe Takers Sentenced in Volgograd 67
Four Arrested in Refuznik Moscow Demonstration *[AFP]* 67
Correction to Ukrainian CP Examines Agro-Industry 67

Economic

CPSU Asks More Support for Cooperatives *[PRAVDA 25 Nov]* 67
Efficacy of Foreign Economic Relations Defended *[IZVESTIYA 20 Nov]* 69
Experts Debate Price Reform Issues *[IZVESTIYA 19 Nov]* 70
Series on Foreign Economies To Appear *[SOTSIALISTICHESKAYA ROSSIYA 22 Nov]* 74

Scientific

Launch of 'Cosmos-1899' Satellite Announced 76
Third Chernobyl Unit Ready for Commissioning 76
    More on Third Reactor 76
U.S., Soviet Space Study Conference Begins 76
Soviet Space Photography Draws U.S. Interest 77

Defense Ministry's Shabanov Discusses SDI, ABM

PM051735 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 5 Dec 87 First Edition pp 1, 5

[Interview of USSR Deputy Defense Minister Army General V. Shabanov by unidentified KRASNAYA ZVEZDA correspondent: "Preventing the Arms Race in Space; Answers of USSR Deputy Defense Minister Army General V. Shabanov to Questions From a KRASNAYA ZVEZDA Correspondent"; date, place of interview unspecified]

[Text] Question. In what way is the militarization of space dangerous for world peace?

Answer. In order to answer this question it is essential first of all to clarify from where the threat of the militarization of space emanates.

At the end of World War II, the United States—our ally in the struggle against fascist Germany and militarist Japan—had already begun to try to occupy the role of world leader, to secure decisive military superiority over the Soviet Union, and to dictate its will to the Soviet Union from a position of strength. It was precisely for the purpose of offering a show of force that atom bombs were dropped in the summer of 1945 upon the Japanese cities of Hiroshima and Nagasaki. However, soon afterward the Soviet Union became the second nuclear power, thus dispelling the U.S. ruling circles' illusory calculations on securing an atomic monopoly.

Subsequent attempts to achieve military-technical superiority—the creation of atomic and hydrogen bombs in the megaton range, intercontinental ballistic missiles with separable warheads, and nuclear powered missile-carrying submarines—yielded nothing for the United States; the USSR always found within a short time an adequate response necessary to maintain strategic parity.

The United States did not succeed in achieving superiority over the USSR by creating ABM defense systems either—such as the Nike Zeus, Sentinel, and Safeguard with a ground-based echelon of information and strike means. All these systems proved to be totally ineffective and work on them was curtailed by the Americans. However they did play a negative role by provoking an unprecedented nuclear missile arms race.

Having failed in numerous attempts to achieve superiority over the USSR on earth, so to speak, the Pentagon channeled its aggressive schemes into space. Under the influence of the Pentagon and of the U.S. military-industrial circles, President Reagan proclaimed in 1983 a program for the militarization of space under the specious name of "Strategic Defense Initiative" (SDI). It was presented to the public at large as a program for the creation of a multi-echeloned system of ABM Defense of the United States against an allegedly possible nuclear missile first strike by the Soviet Union. However, an analysis carried out by authoritative experts both in the United States and in other countries of the work which has gotten under way in the framework of the SDI program shows that this program is pursuing by no means defensive objectives, but is of a patently aggressive nature.

A special role in the SDI program is assigned by its authors to the space echelon of ABM defense which, they calculate, must destroy at least 80% of the Soviet ballistic missiles during the active stage of their flight trajectory prior to the separation of the warheads [boyevyye bloki]. But scientists have proved cogently that it is virtually impossible to completely parry a massed nuclear missile first strike by either of the sides. If only 100 medium-class nuclear warheads [boyevyye bloki] penetrate an ABM system (which is only a small percentage of their total number in a first strike), this would be equivalent in total yield to 3,000 of the atomic bombs dropped by the United States on Hiroshima and Nagasaki.

The question naturally arises: Are the authors and defenders of the SDI program aware of all this? They most certainly are. But the point is, they are trying to conceal from the public at large the second and most important part of the SDI program—work on creating an offensive space-based "space-to-ground" weapon. This weapon, according to the schemes of the authors of SDI, is to be capable of inflicting suddenly and rapidly a disabling strike against the strategic arms and the most important military-industrial installations of the Soviet Union in order to deprive us of the opportunity to inflict a retaliatory strike with all available strategic means. The ABM system being created in accordance with the SDI program must in this situation ensure for the United States the opportunity to destroy the remaining small quantity of Soviet missiles in what would allegedly be a feeble retaliatory strike by the USSR.

It is obvious that the effective destruction of targets on the surface of the earth from space will require a large expenditure of energy which can be ensured only by means of space-based nuclear devices. Information about the participation of a series of leading U.S. laboratories—Los Alamos, Livermore, and Sandia—in the creation of nuclear devices of this kind has already become widely known and is published openly in the U.S. press. It is clear that by parading the SDI program as something peaceful and nonnuclear, certain U.S. military political circles are merely trying to conceal its actually aggressive thrust and nuclear content.

It is no accident that Dr Robert Bowman, a prominent U.S. expert, and president of the Institute for Space and Security Studies, declared recently in Washington: "The 'Star Wars' Program has nothing to do with defense. This is an attempt to achieve absolute military superiority through the creation of new offensive arms which are passed off as defensive ones."

The reply to the question raised is thus perfectly clear—the militarization of space is yet another step toward a total nuclear catastrophe.

Question. Which circles in the United States are particularly interested in the implementation of the program of the so called "Strategic Defense Initiative?"

Answer. In putting forward the SDI Program, President R. Reagan's administration was counting, figuratively speaking, on killing several "birds" with one stone.

First, it was hoping to win broad popularity among voters by luring them with the tempting, albeit illusory, prospect of taking cover from the nuclear threat allegedly emanating from the Soviet Union behind the SDI's antimissile shield. However, broader and broader sections of the U.S. public can see today that the Soviet Union's consistent peace initiatives totally demolish the myth of the "Soviet military threat" and have shown to the whole world that the SDI has but a single thrust—an aggressive one.

Second, the SDI program gives the administration a fine opportunity to guarantee a long-term stable source of colossal revenue for the bosses of the military-industrial complex who in fact determine basic aspects of U.S. domestic and foreign policy. According to assessments by experts from the J. Hopkins Institute, the cost of the deployment and maintenance in constant combat readiness for a period of 10 years of merely the first (space) echelon of SDI will be $630-770 billion. It is obvious that whereas SDI promises the military-industrial complex unprecedented profits, it will prove to be an onerous tax burden on the shoulders of ordinary Americans. The recent panic on the stock exchanges of the United States and other leading capitalist countries confirmed that military programs of unprecedented scale cannot fail to undermine the stability of their economies.

Third, major scientific forces of the United States and other countries have been drawn into work on the SDI program. The majority of leading scientists of the world, indisputably realize that the Soviet Union has not had, nor does it have, any aggressive intentions vis-a-vis the United States or other countries. So how can one explain the decision of many of them to participate in the elaboration of military programs? It is attributable to their extreme material dependence on the Pentagon and the military-industrial corporations.

Having given a powerful dollar impetus to the development of science-intensive sectors of industry, and by generously subsidizing scientific and experimental research in the most imporant spheres of science and technology, the militarist circles of the United States are seeking once again to acheieve military-technical superiority over the Soviet Union, to break the strategic parity which has taken shape, and to attempt once again to dictate their will to us from a position of strength. These frutiless attempts, as before, are doomed to failure.

Thus the reply to your second question is perfectly clear: It is not the ordinary Americans who are particularly interested in the implementation of the SDI program, but the bosses of the military-industrial complex and aggressively inclined militarist circles of the U.S. military and political leadership.

Question. The world expects specific results from the third and fourth meetings of the top USSR and U.S. leaders in a key issue of eliminating the nuclear threat—the issue of reducing strategic offensive means and preventing weapons from being taken out into space.

Why is the preservation of the ABM Treaty for at least 10 years in the form in which it was signed and ratified an essential condition for reaching an accord on the reduction of strategic offensive arms by 50% on both sides?

Answer. The SDI program, as has already been said, provides for weapons to be put into space which could be used not just for defensive, but also for aggressive purposes. Just by itself this would lead to the disruption of the established strategic parity. The United States would acquire one-sided advantages through this. They would then be tempted to carry out with impunity a nuclear attack in the hope that they would, with the aid of a multi-echeloned ABM system, be able to defend U.S. territory against a substantially weakened retributory strike. Venturing upon a reduction of strategic arms—especially by 50%—would in such a case mean disarming on our side in the face of a mounting danger.

At the same time, it is common knowledge that the implementation of the SDI program contravenes the unlimited Soviet-U.S. ABM Treaty of 1972. Observance of this treaty strengthens confidence between the USSR and the United States, and creates the stability in their mutual realtions on the basis of which it is possible to conduct constuctive negotiations on a real reduction of strategic offensive arms.

Why do we talk about observing the ABM Treaty for at least 10 years? The fact is, 10 years is an approximate period for the research and development necessary for creating complex, long-term systems of armaments. During this period the Americans, having spent many billions of dollars, would be able to see for themselves once again the impossibility of creating an "absolute" antiballistic missile defense and the unreality of attaining the goals of the "Star Wars" program.

Question. Is it possible sufficiently quickly to create effective means to counter the SDI program, that is, to prepare a reliable and economical response to this program?

Answer. The contemporary development of science and technology gives us objective potential to devise various means and methods of countering the space strike weapons being created in line with the SDI program and, should the need arise, of overcoming the multi-echeloned ABM system. Some of them have been given detailed press coverage in our country and abroad. A distinctive feature of the countermeasures is that it is possible to implement them more rapidly and cheaply than the SDI program can be implemented.

If we had been the first to come up with some new program similar to SDI the American would also have found sufficiently effective retaliatory means. There is no doubt about it. But this path leads to an unprecedented arms race.

M.S. Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, has repeatedly spoken of that fact that, should the need arise, we will be able to give an answer to the SDI program. In the book *Perestroyka and New Thinking for Our Country and the Whole World*, which was published recently in many countries, including the United States, he writes once again: "If the United States does not renounce SDI, we do not intend to make life easy for it. The response will be effective, reliable, and economical. We have made a detailed study [my imeyem prorabotku] of how to render SDI ineffective [kak obestsenit SOI], without spending the kind of fabulous sums which the United States needs for its creation. Let the Americans think again: Is it worth exhausting themselves with their SDI? In any case it will not be able to ensure reliable defense."

Deryabin on Eliminating Tactical Nuclear Arms

LD041329 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1230 GMT 4 Dec

[Text] Moscow, 4 Dec (TASS)—A TASS diplomatic correspondent reports:

The Soviet side is in favor of ridding Europe of tactical nuclear weapons, Yuriy Deryabin, head of the department for issues of security and cooperation in Europe at the USSR Foreign Ministry [name and title as received], said today in an interview with a TASS diplomatic correspondent.

That would be an important step along the path of global nuclear disarmament. We would like, the Soviet spokesman noted, the discussions at the Vienna CSCE meeting in the framework of consultations between representatives of the member states of the Warsaw Pact and NATO to be more constructive. A similar approach, after all, led to the accord on the elimination of medium- and shorter-range missiles in Europe. However, two different approaches to the problem of tactical nuclear weapons (weapons with a range below 500 km) are still being displayed in Vienna in the dicussion of issues connected with the mandate for future negotiations on reducing armed forces and conventional arms in Europe.

The socialist countries are in favor of issues of reducing conventional arms being solved in a package together with tactical nuclear missiles, strike aircraft, nuclear artillery, and other tactical nuclear weapons. The NATO countries, operating under the term "negotiations on conventional stability," are categorically against including tactical nuclear arms and strike aircraft in the agenda of negotiations on conventional weapons.

Taking the positions of the NATO countries into account, the Soviet delegation submitted in October 1987 a compromise proposal according to which armed forces and conventional weapons, including "dual purpose" land-based weapons, would be the subject of negotiations. It is intended here that in the course of the actual negotiations, interested states will examine issues related to the whole range of problems connected with limiting and reducing tactical nuclear arms. But even this version of a solution is meeting with resistance from NATO countries.

NATO sees the priority task as being "the elimination of the potential for carrying out a surprise attack or for the start of large-scale offensive operations." One cannot fail to agree with this way of posing the question. But is it really possible to accomplish this task by preserving tactical nuclear weapons in all their forms? After all, bearing in mind their features and tactical characteristics, the tactical nuclear weapons constitute not only an important offensive, but also the most destabilizing, mobile element of military power. It is illogical to consider tactical nuclear means in isolation from conventional weapons for the additional reason that most of them can carry both conventional and nuclear charges.

The NATO position also contradicts the political logic of disarmament, the Soviet spokesman said in conclusion. The USSR's proposals at the Vienna meeting open up opportunities for resolving the question of the elimination of yet another—after the medium- and shorter-range class of weapons—tactical nuclear weapon. "Three nuclear zeroes" would clear Europe of the piles of destructive weapons and would substantially propel this, and other, continents toward a nonnuclear peace.

Tenin Hits 'Dishonest' U.S. Approach to CW Ban

PM031111 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 2 Dec 87 Morning Edition p 5

[Candidate of Military Sciences Major General B. Tenin article: "There Must Be No Room for Chemical Weapons on Earth"]

[Text] Trust has for a long time been an element of international negotiating practices. It is a catalyst which, coupled with compromise, advances talks.

The Soviet Union recently performed a major act of trust in its partners at the talks to ban chemical weapons. They learned virtually everything about the range of the Soviet chemical arsenal following a visit to the Shikhany military installation in Saratov Oblast. An installation which is secret under all the rules of state security.

That was an event without precedent at the talks and was something of a surprise for the West whose propaganda machine, by the force of inertia, continues to play the motifs of the Soviet Union's "excessive secrecy" and "excessive level of armaments." In fact our country is prepared, on a reciprocal basis with all other countries possessing an advanced chemical industry, to dismantle fully and forever the apparatus of chemical warfare, including stockpiles, installations, and laboratories, and to place that industry's entire activity under strict international monitoring.

The Americans responded to the Soviet gesture of trust by inviting Soviet diplomats and experts to their military base in Tooele. Prior to that, a group of Soviet experts visited a West German Bundeswehr chemical installation in Muenster. It would seem that bridges of trust are finally being built. For some reason, however, U.S. diplomacy has started backpedaling in its forecasts regarding the time for the convention's conclusion. Now this is already "in 18 months' or 2 years' time," and subject to whether, as a high-ranking White House spokesman declared, "this convention would be advantageous" for the United States. Bluntly speaking, such a convention is not advantageous for the U.S. military-industrial complex, nor is it advantageous for the Pentagon which, banking on a new generation of chemical weapons—binary weapons—consoles itself with illusions about ensuring superiority. Exactly the same approach as in nuclear affairs and space affairs.

In their attempts to sow the seeds of suspicion against the Soviet Union while they themselves emerge "whiter than white," people in Washington are banking on the fact that, they say, "the Soviets ought to disclose their stocks of chemical weapons." Then, they say, we'll see: Suppose they are greater than in the United States by a whole order of magnitude? But it is well-known that parity has hitherto also been maintained in the sides' chemical arsenals. Generally speaking, the one who has more weapons will have to work harder on their elimination.

As regards the notification of stockpiles and their location, the Soviet position is simple and based on healthy logic: All information on stockpiles can be disclosed, but this ought to be done jointly and with political backing. Such information could be disclosed even without waiting for the convention's signing. But the convention ought to be, obviously, almost completed and its future main participants ought to officially declare their readiness to append their signatures to it.

Meanwhile, we have already come across repeated instances which can hardly be said to testify to the honesty of the U.S. stance. Here are just three examples.

Back in September 1981 A. Haig, secretary of state at the time, declared that the United States had conclusive proof of the use of chemical weapons in Asia. Note this: "Conclusive." This marked the beginning of a campaign, whipped up by Washington, alleging that the "yellow rain," containing toxic substances called trichothecenes [as published], was a new chemical weapon used by the USSR in Southeast Asian countries.

Not so long ago, *The Washington Post* reported in detail how this forgery was fabricated. The "Soviet chemical weapons," which were created [sozdannoye] by the fevered imagination of politicians of Haig's ilk and puzzled many biochemists in the West, proved to be a phenomenon, common in southern Asia including China, whereby a yellow substance is formed either from products of the honey bee's activity or from flower pollen.

For what reason and to what end was this censure fanned? In 1981 it was to wreck the SALT II process and to prepare the ground for implementation of NATO's "two-track decision" on the deployment of U.S. medium-range means in Europe; in 1982 to activate plans for the binary rearmament of U.S. chemical arsenals; and in 1983 and subsequent years—for the very same purposes and, in addition, to apply the brakes to the multilateral chemical disarmament talks and for the sake of adding to NATO's "flexible response" doctrine the concept of "integrated battlefield," which envisages the mass application of chemical weapons, in parallel with nuclear weapons, at the very early stages of a military conflict in the European Theater of war.

Second example: Having launched its campaign to break away from the ABM Treaty, the U.S. Administration started resorting in practice to the dissemination of lists of alleged "cases" of violations of international agreements by the Soviet Union. Whenever, in one way or another, these hollow "cases" burst under pressure from obvious facts, the list in question was enriched by yet another portion of slander. Chemical weapons, whose use in war was banned by the 1925 Geneva Protocol, were, of course, not ignored. A flagrant fabrication was circulated regarding the use of chemical weapons in Afghanistan. But, like a boomerang, it immediately rebounded on those who had forged it.

Samples of chemical combat ammunition made in the United States, Britain, and West Germany were captured in different parts of Afghanistan following the liquidation of counterrevolutionary groupings. They included: Chemical grenades containing the toxic substance "CS," made in the United States and stamped with the codes M7P and 517, as well as some made in Britain and stamped with the code 1A 3; chemical grenades containing the toxic substance "Chloracetophenon" made in the United States (code 119) and the FRG; plastic bullets for Walther pistols containing "Chloracetophenon"; and tablets containing the toxic substance "Phostoxin" for poisoning water, made in the FRG. This is a blatant violation by the United States and leading NATO countries of the 1925 Geneva Protocol and, if such actions were to be called by their proper names, they constitute a crime against an entire people.

Finally, the dishonest U.S. stance on the problem of banning chemical weapons is in direct contradiction with another question which would seem to have been resolved. We are talking about steps against the 1972 convention banning the development, production, and stockpiling of bacteriological (biological) and toxin weapons and on their destruction. First, attempts are made to describe this convention as ineffective and, using this as a precedent, to slow down and torpedo the talks on the banning of chemical weapons. Second, having undermined the biological convention itself, attempts are made to achieve something else—to free their hands for launching a race in yet another type of mass destruction weapon.

The main military center for the development [razrabotka] of new types of bacteriological weapons has been set up in Daguze [name as transliterated], Utah. The Western press has reported that, as a result of genetic engineering manipulations conducted there, new varieties of such weapons have been produced which have also affected some animal species inhabiting the desert region.

On 15 January 1986 the USSR put forward a program for the liquidation of nuclear and other mass destruction weapons by the year 2000. Almost 2 years have passed since: What has been done in that time? A treaty on the global elimination of their medium- and shorter-range missiles by the sides has been prepared. A Soviet-U.S. agreement has been signed on the creation of centers to reduce the nuclear danger. A convention on the universal and total ban of chemical weapons is on the negotiating table and is almost ready.

History will not forgive those who have not done the work, or have refused to make use of the fruits of the work, which has already been done on the path to universal chemical disarmament.

Gerasimov on Summit's Effects for Europe

PM041535 London ITV Television Network in English 2030 GMT 3 Dec 87

[From the "This Week" program, presented by Jonathan Dimbleby]

[Excerpt] [Dimbleby] Good evening and welcome to "This Week" on the eve of what is being billed, and perhaps for once without exaggeration, as an historic moment—a summit between the superpowers here in Washington, where Mr Gorbachev and President Reagan will sign an agreement to eliminate an entire category of nuclear weapons. Tonight I'll be asking Gennadiy Gerasimov, Mr Gorbachev's chief spokesman on foreign affairs, about Moscow's purpose and what it would mean for Europe and especially for us in Britain. [passage omitted]

[Dimbleby] Gennadiy Gerasimov is Mr Gorbachev's chief spokesman on foreign affairs. First could I ask you: Apart from mutual expressions of goodwill, what does Mr Gorbachev hope to achieve from his meeting when he stops off in London on his way here?

[Gerasimov] Well, I guess it's a refueling stop and will be also fueling of ideas from one side to another and vice versa. So it will be, I hope, exchange of views which will be helpful for everybody.

[Dimbleby] Why particularly Mrs Thatcher and not any other European leader?

[Gerasimov] I think because we developed good, friendly, personal relationship between our leaders. This is point number one. And second, we listen to what your prime minister's going to say.

[Dimbleby] Do you regard her as the, in many ways the most significant European figure now? Is that why?

[Gerasimov] Well, I don't think we can just play this game: who is important, who is less important. But I think this stopover and this short working visit shows that we are concerned not only with Soviet-American relations, important as they are, but also with relations with European countries.

[Dimbleby] But there is, as you know, considerable anxiety in Europe about the conventional weapons, while your strategic missiles in the Soviet Union, you could lower the sights, put less fuel in the rockets, so to speak, and you could still attack Western Europe—with Western Europe, not from the soil of Western Europe, being able to retaliate. [sentence as heard]

[Gerasimov] Well, we are not going to attack anybody. But, theoretically speaking, you are right in a sense that this particular treaty which is going to be signed, good as it is as step number one, cannot stand on its own feet for too long, because really we can use other missiles [American pronunciation], just to retarget them. That's right. Or missiles [British pronunciation], in English.... So we must follow this step number one with the second step, which is cutting in half—which is not yet cutting to size [as heard]—our nuclear arsenals.

[Dimbleby] You say it can't stand on its own for very long. What sort of time scale does it have before either you retarget or NATO feels obliged to put in other weapons to replace the departing cruise missiles?

[Gerasimov] It cannot stand on its own feet because on the American side or NATO side you can add American bombers with nuclear bombs to your arsenal or just put forward your submarines or just ships with cruise missiles [American pronunciation-]—Missiles [British pronunciation], sorry—cruise missiles with nuclear warheads, so it is the beginning, but it must be supported by other steps.

[Dimbleby] What would happen, what would be the Soviet response, what would you either say or do, if the other steps weren't achieved quickly and as a consequence NATO decided to deploy, for instance, cruise missiles in aeroplanes based in Europe and particularly in Britain?

[Gerasimov] Well, this is one way to undermine the treaty. The idea of the treaty is to get away with [as heard] these intermediate missiles in Europe, and if you are going to introduce substitutes then it means that you're going to ruin the whole treaty. I hope it is not in the plans.

[Dimbleby] Do you expect there to be a treaty signed cutting strategic weapons by half early next summer?

[Gerasimov] That's our proposed timetable, so to say, and we think that it's possible if there is political will on both sides, then all those details can be dealt with.

[Dimbleby] Can you confirm that, if the treaty on strategic weapons does go ahead, that it will have no effect on britain's capacity to buy and deploy the trident missiles, as Britain's independent deterrent?

[Gerasimov] Well, it's your business: that's for you to decide. My hope is that if we go successfully down the road of nuclear disarmament, then this particular issue is going to be obsolete.

[Dimbleby] Is going to be obsolete?

[Gerasimov] Obsolete.

[Dimbleby] Why obsolete?

[Gerasimov] Because if we are going seriously to have nuclear disarmament, then at a certain stage Britain and France will join the process. As I understand, otherwise we cannot disarm till zero, unless we involve other nuclear powers, which means Britain, France, and China. Up till now it's not yet in the books, so to say, but the time is going to come.

[Dimbleby] But from your point of view that can happen, that final act can happen, all at once, however far down the road it might be.

[Gerasimov] Well, it must be, it must happen simultaneously.

[Dimbleby] Mr Karpov said the other day—your chief negotiator—that he would expect Britain to make an offer if the 50% cut on strategic weapons, superpower weapons, goes ahead. But that's not a condition, as I understand it from what you're saying, of that treaty going ahead. You would like Britain to do something, but you don't expect Britain to do anything necessarily.

[Gerasimov] Personally, I don't expect... at this stage, no, personally, of course, I would like to, but I understand the realities of your position, so I don't really expect it.

[Dimbleby] Mr Gerasimov, has the time now passed when it would be possible for the Soviet Union to intervene militarily in the name of socialism in Eastern Europe? Is that time now gone?

[Gerasimov] Yes, it is.

[Dimbleby] That will not happen again?

[Gerasimov] Well, we have our troops stationed in several countries, because you have NATO. We have Warsaw Pact. If you don't like this ask Americans to leave. They are also there in Europe in great numbers. Actually, we suggested long ago to dismantle both blocs, NATO and Warsaw Pact, and this offer still stands, so if we are going to dismantle them there will be no reason for the Soviet troops to be in Poland, for instance, or Czechoslovakia.

[Dimbleby] But even within the present arrangements, the present status of the Warsaw Pact and NATO, there would not be circumstances like there were 20 years ago in Czechoslovakia in which you would ever regard it as appropriate to intervene in Eastern European affairs?

[Gerasimov] But they are there, the troops are there. They are there; because they are just integrated system of Warsaw pact countries [as heard]. We have troops in East Germany, in Czechoslovakia...

[Dimbleby] But you know the distinction...

[Gerasimov] ...along the communications in Poland...

[Dimbleby] But you know the distinction I'm making very well, don't you?

[Gerasimov] For instance, we...

[Dimbleby] Glasnost has talked quite a bit about this...

[Gerasimov] No, when they when they had crisis, so-called crisis in Poland there was a lot of talk about Soviet troops intervening. It never happened.

[Dimbleby] And the time is now past for that, is what you're saying...

[Gerasimov] Actually, troops were there.

[Dimbleby] But the intervention, the time for that kind of intervention, is over, is what you said.

[Gerasimov] Yes.

[Dimbleby] Thank you. If Mr Gorbachev were in the way of things and—it can happen—were run over by the proverbial bus, would the policies that you've enunciated continue or would it all go into grinding reverse?

[Gerasimov] I don't think so, because he's supported by the majority of the population, and of course he has his support in the leadership.

[Dimbleby] Are you optimistic about the events that flow from this summit?

[Gerasimov] Oh yes, that's why we are here. We have great hopes; maybe it will be just a—they use the word maybe too often—breakthrough. Maybe this time it will be a real breakthrough. [words indistinct] We must wait a little bit.

[Dimbleby] Mr Gerasimov, thank you very much.

Shishlin: 'Uncomfortable' Optimism on Summit

*LD062202 Prague Television Service in Czech
1830 GMT 6 Dec 87*

[Interview with Nikolay Shishlin, deputy chief of the CPSU Propaganda Department, by unidentified presenter—recorded; date and place not given; questions and answers are in Russian, fading into Czech translation]

[Text] [Presenter] The meeting between Mikhail Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, and Ronald Reagan, the U.S. President, will begin here in the White House in 2 days. What is the outlook for this meeting of extraordinary significance? This is the subject I want to discuss today with Nikolay Shishlin, one official from a group of Soviet experts here in Washington. Under what conditions can an agreement, or rather, progress in the reduction of strategic arms be reached, in your view?

[Shishlin] I believe that this is the key question of the coming meeting and the Soviet Union's stand is simple. In the first place, we must discuss a 50% reduction in strategic offensive weapons; second, we must reinforce the regime of the ABM treaty. This is the essence of our stance.

[Presenter] Will Comrade Gorbachev bring with him to Washington new proposals in this regard?

[Shishlin] I expect action from both sides here since the Soviet position is sufficiently well known. It was explained in Moscow to Secretary of State Shultz, and it was explained in the letter sent 2 or 3 weeks ago by Mikhail Gorbachev to President Reagan. This, however, does not mean that surprises cannot happen. We would like to wish that these are pleasant surprises.

[Presenter] What specific questions might the new proposals touch upon?

[Shishlin] I believe that the key issue—and I like to repeat this—is to assign instructions to the appropriate representatives of the Soviet Union and the United States on how to work and on what kind of aim they should strive for when they are tackling the question of a reduction in the numbers of strategic offensive arms. This is precisely what the U.S. president should bring with him to Moscow next year.

[Presenter] Can this also concern conventional arms, let us say, in Europe?

[Shishlin] Of course, for this is one of the key issues we have to tackle.

[Presenter] Do you think that new Soviet proposals could catch the U.S. side unprepared, as happened, for instance, in Reykjavik?

[Shishlin] I hope that since that time we have progressed and have gotten to know each other better and that the question of unpreparedness is perhaps misplaced. But concerning U.S. reaction, that is frequently incalculable.

[Presenter] You have been in Washington for almost a week. How would you assess the political atmosphere before Comrade Gorbachev's visit?

[Shishlin] If we were to judge it in terms of school marks, it would be about C plus or B at most. You know, there is light and shadow here, but the light nonetheless prevails.

[Presenter] So you are optimistic about the possible outcome of the meeting?

[Shishlin] I am optimistic although this is an uncomfortable position. To be a pessimist is much more comfortable because when everything ends successfully everyone forgets the pessimist.

[Presenter] On what do you base your optimism?

[Shishlin] It is based on experiences from Geneva and Reykjavik and, moreover, on the fact that this meeting is taking place on U.S. soil. We have covered a distance that is not so much geographical as political.

Weekly 'International Observers Roundtable'

LD062045 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1230 GMT 6 Dec 87

["International Observers Roundtable" program with Boris Vasilyevich Andrianov, All-Union Radio foreign affairs commentator; Nikolay Ivanovich Agayants, international affairs journalist; and Viktor Nikolayevich Levin, international affairs journalist]

[Text] [Andrianov] Hello, Comrades. Taking part in today's roundtable meeting are my colleagues Nikolay Ivanovich Agayants and Viktor Nikolayevich Levin, international affairs journalists who are well-known to you.

We have gathered on the eve of an event that is awaited with impatience and hope by the whole world. Tomorrow Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, will start his visit to Washington, where the latest Soviet-U.S. summit meeting is to be held. It will be the third such meeting, and comes after the meetings of the Soviet leader and the U.S. President in Geneva and Reykjavik. Indeed one may boldly say that it was precisely Geneva and Reykjavik that have paved the difficult way to Washington. Unlike the two previous meetings the upcoming meeting in the U.S. capital is assuming truly epoch-making significance. In Washington the general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee and the U.S. President are to sign a document that is unique for the present time—namely, a treaty on the elimination of medium range and shorter range missiles. In other words the point is that a whole class of nuclear-missile weaponry is to be scrapped. It is due to vanish not just from combat positions but indeed from the face of the earth altogether. A start is thus being made to real disarmament, and this is undoubtedly in itself a vast triumph for realism and common sense. This is indisputably being perceived to be the practical outcome of the important and difficult talks that Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev and Ronald Reagan have held previously.

[Agayants] However, Boris Vasilyevich, both realism and common sense prompt the thought that the treaty which is to be signed by the leaders of the Soviet Union and the United States ought to be regarded not only as an historic achievement. It needs too to be appraised as a potential accelerator of efforts on the way to achieving a nuclear-free world, the more so, since on the way to such a world the signing of the treaty on medium range and shorter range missiles marks only the first step. It does of course inspire hope, but this hope needs to be reinforced by real deeds, and it ought to be justified by practical actions.

[Levin] I think that it is fitting too to emphasize that the upcoming Washington meeting is greatly favored by the general political situation, including the situation on a global scale. I have in mind the whole world greeting with approval the news about the third Soviet-U.S. summit meeting—I could mention here also that it is the first meeting between Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev and Ronald Reagan not on the soil of a third country but on the soil of one of the two Great Powers, on the soil of the United States. We hope that their next meeting will be on Soviet soil. Well then, this news about the meeting in Washington was greeted with great approval and there was no less approval for the decision to sign at the meeting a treaty on eliminating medium range and shorter range missiles—the signing being due to take place, it is assumed, on the 8th. I think it is particularly important that a similar attitude has been displayed in all the countries where missiles of this class have been sited, or where preparations have been made for their deployment.

Incidentally in this regard our listeners will certainly be interested to learn that the United States has decided to undertake the commitment immediately after the signing of the treaty on eliminating medium range and shorter range missils to give up further deployment of the missiles. Thus the treaty that is to be signed in Washington—and there is no doubt about that—although it is formally a Soviet-U.S. one, is in its essence of an international character, since it affects the security interests of at least nine states on whose soil these missiles are presently located. All these states—and I mean all states, since the Soviet Union and the United States have already expressed their opinions very clearly—approve of this treaty.

Nikolay Ivanovich was just remarking that the forthcoming signing of the treaty on medium range and shorter range missiles marks only the first step on the way to a nuclear-free world. This is certainly so, but we do know after all that the focus of attention of the Washington talks—and this has been stated both by Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev and by Ronald Reagan—will include the question of the prospects for a sharp 50% reduction in strategic offensive armaments. As Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev noted in his interview for the U.S. NBC television company, solid progress could be achieved in this main area of nuclear disarmament under the present U.S. Administration. Thus it is a matter of achieving new major accords during President Reagan's return visit to Moscow in 1988—accords on an issue that lies at the hub of Soviet-U.S. relations.

[Andrianov] You, Viktor Nikolayevich, have just been mentioning Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev's interview. Indeed this interview with the Soviet leader met with a tremendous response abroad. The countdown before the Soviet-U.S. summit meeting in Washington began with an outstanding example of television glasnost—that is how the Italian *Corriere Della Sera* succinctly commented on the interivew, stressing its importance. Incidentally *The New York Times* reports that the interview was watched by almost 9 million U.S. families. In the view of the British *Guardian*, ordinary Americans liked what they saw and heard, and it inspired them with hope. According to America's *Boston Globe* the Soviet leader earned his first points in the struggle for the hearts and minds of Americans prior to the summit meeting.

[Agayants] The interview given by the general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, *The Washington Post* points out, was the first sign that the the international press is beginning to be gripped by summit meeting fever. Washington has already prepared for an event which will be covered by almost 6,000 journalists representing the press, radio and television of various countries. The NBC, ABC and CBS television companies are planning special programs every evening, it is reported. They also have plans to cover all major briefings and events and, for the sake of this, to cancel other broadcasts that were previosuly scheduled for the time.

[Levin] But it seems that Japan's NHK Television company has decided to set the record. It has decided to broadcast 96 hours of live programs from Washington. That is to say, the entire duration of the visit is due to be directly covered. There are even provisions that while Washington is sleeping NHK will be broadcasting live rpeortages on the reaction in other countries to the events taking place in Washington.

[Agayants] Yes, it really is amazing. An international press center will begin functioning in Washington tomorrow at 0900 in the morning local time. It is housed at Marriott Hotel, which is situated at the intersection of Fourteenth Street and Pennsylvania Avenue. This is where the whole apparatus of staff members of the White House Press department will be at work throughout the summit meeting.

[Levin] We have already said that the preparations for this meeting had come to the fore several days ago in the news bulletins of the U.S. mass information media. This reflects the attention that is being paid to the forthcoming event by the U.S. public. You know too that Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev's interview was carried back on 30 November on U.S. television—on NBC's channels. Then on Thursday—Thursday last [3 December]—four major U.S. television companies were given an interview by President Reagan. You, comrades, have already been acquainted with that interview in our previous news reports. However, I should also like to draw attention to a number of points. The interview reflected the complexity of the political guidelines and standpoints of the White House and the complexity of the political struggle within the United States. On the one hand the President says that the upcoming signing of the Soviet-U.S. agreement on eliminating medium- and shorter-range missiles is of great importance, and that despite the claims by critics alleging that the Soviet Union is getting some kind of military advantages as a result of this agreement he is convinced, and undertakes to prove, that the Soviet Union is not deriving any advantages—that is to say, the agreement accords equally with the interests of both the United States and the Soviet Union and also the North Atlantic Bloc and the Warsaw Pact organization—and speaks of his wish to achieve a 50% reduction in strategic offensive armaments.

At the same time in answer to a direct question from four journalists President Reagan said—and I am quoting him verbatim: I have not changed from the time when I spoke about an evil empire. It would, of course, be absurd to expect that President Reagan had radically altered his attitude toward the Soviet Union. But this emphasizing of his references to an empire of evil on the threshold of such a meeting looks, it seems to me, not very encouraging.

On the other hand, however,televisions companies and certain other mass information services have held a poll of public opinion in the United States regarding the personal popularity of Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev and Ronald Reagan. We have told you repeatedly in the past that the President's personal popularity in the United States is very high. Now the public opinion poll shows that the popularity of Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev—and one needs to take account of the effect of many years of anti-Soviet propaganda on Americans—is closely approaching the indicator figures characterizing the popularity of Reagan. It seems to me that this once again reminds us also that the television interview with Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev transmitted in the United States did indeed make a very deep impression—by no means only that interview, however, but the Soviet Union's entire policy, a policy which, for the Americans, is embodied in the person of the general secretary of our party's Central Committee.

[Agayants] Even the so-called Committee on the Present Danger, Viktor Nikolayevich, has been forced to acknowledge that most Americans welcome the forthcoming summit meeting. I say even that committee because ever since it was set up 11 years ago it has constantly frightened Americans with the Soviet threat, opposing accords between the United States and the Soviet Union. The leaders of that organization are doing their utmost to sow suspicions in American minds regarding the treaty on medium- and shorter-range missiles, proclaiming that it might allegedly provide advantages to the Soviet Union and inflict some kind of damage on U.S. security.

[Andrianov] The Committee on the Present Danger is by no means alone in its efforts to poison the atmosphere in the country with various kinds of anti-Soviet conjectures and distortion of the essence of the treaty to be signed in Washington. Extreme right-wing political groups are attempting to torpedo the signing of the treaty, endeavoring to play on the familiar feeling of distrust toward the Soviet Union, which has been implanted amongst broad strata of the U.S. population by systematic and large-scale anti-Soviet propaganda.

At the moment, the right-wing U.S. press is playing an old tune: for example, the *New York City Tribune* newspaper, which belongs to that section of the press, has published an interview with General Henry Moore, a well known U.S. military expert. He claims that the upcoming agreement with the Soviet Union creates merely a dangerous illusion of advantage for the United States. According to this military man the Soviet SS-20 missiles are, allegedly, patently obsolete and would have to be destroyed or replaced in the near future in any case, whereas the U.S. Pershings, he says, are the very latest in combat technology. For that reason, stated Gen Moore, the planned deal is tantamount to swapping a pound of gold for a pound of ash. It's in this kind of offhand manner, without adducing the slightest argument based on serious objective analysis, that they are attempting simply to abuse a treaty the two countries have been preparing for a long time, thoroughly considering every element with a bearing on the elaboration of that document.

[Levin] I would also mention something that is very noticeable—and it is in the United States that this is happening: Efforts by certain circles to make it look as if the United States, by opting for an agreement with the Soviet Union on the elimination of medium- and shorter-range missiles, has inflicted damage on the interests of its West European allies. This is what Kissinger is saying, as is that same Gen Moore whom you have just mentioned, together with many others.

But let's hear the view of a West European representative—FRG Minister of Foreign Affairs Genscher. Here's what he has to say: The double-zero decision is a great success for our security policy. The destruction of more than 1,500 Soviet warheads, each of which has several times the destructive force of the bomb dropped on Hiroshima, will enable us to breathe a sigh of relief. The double-zero decision, continues Genscher, does not create a new risk; it removes a risk already existing, since security is being enhanced not by piling-up destruction potentials—and moreover, with one side enjoying superiority—but by reducing them.

So let's take a look at this statement; it is noteworthy in many respects. Indeed, according to Western estimates—and I think they are close to the truth—the Soviet Union is destroying 1,500 warheads, while the United States is destroying approximately 350 warheads. On the basis of this one might get the impression that there is an element of inequality, but it's the other way round—inequality for the Soviet Union. If Genscher says that as a result of the destruction of Soviet warheads

West Europeans can breathe more freely, then the inhabitants of the Warsaw Pact particpants countries can also breathe with the same degree of relief. In today's world it's not a question of who has slightly more or slightly fewer of these warheads; it's a question of removing the very danger of nuclear war. It is in this that the treaty's importance lies, and it is for this reason that the agreement, to a tremendous extent, is in line with the interests of the Soviet Union and the other socialist countries—its allies—because these 350 U.S. warheads are being removed and reduce the threat.

[Agayants] I would like to add the following to what you have said, Viktor Nikolayevich. The news that Mikhail Sergeyevich is to stop over on his way to Washington in the British capital, where he will have a meeting and brief talks with Prime Minister Margaret Thatcher was received by the British public not only as a good sign of further improvement in Soviet-British relations, but also as yet another manifestation of the triumph of the new political thinking, of new approaches in contemporary international relations. For our part, we cannot fail to be pleased by the British Government's realistic stance regarding the upcoming Soviet-U.S. summit meeting and the signing of the agreement on medium- and shorter-range missiles. Here are just two examples.

Speaking in Peebles at a conference of the Conservative Party's youth organization, George Younger, the British defense secretary, stated that this agreement—and I quote him—is a historic one since it will be the first to lead to the reduction and destruction of an entire class of nuclear missiles on our planet. I sincerely hope that once all the difficult talks are over the U.S. Congress will ratify the missile agreement which is to be signed in Washington during the summit meeting—this was stated in a BBC television interview by Callaghan, a prominent British public figure and former prime minister of the country.

[Levin] At the same time, I think we should not overlook that Margaret Thatcher is stubbornly repeating her idea that without nuclear weapons no stable peace can exist, and Britain is still refusing to talk about reducing its nuclear forces. So, you see, notwithstanding the undoubtedly tremendous significance of Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev's stopover in London, we have to see the world as it is, in all its variety and contradiction, and through these contradictions—dialectical contradictions—pursue our clear and consistent course, a course which expresses that which is today known as new political thinking. [Andrianov] But let's get back, all the same, to the situation now taking shape in the United States. While on this subject one cannot omit to mention, once again, those who are blatantly opposed to the treaty, just as they are to Soviet-U.S. cooperation in general. These adversaries, representatives of right-wing circles, have carried out, on the eve of the Washington meeting, a frontal attack on the very idea of concluding an agreement on medium- and shorter-range missiles. The tone of this campaign is being set by a group of the most conservative members of the U.S. Congress led by Senator Jesse Helms, whose views are extremely right-wing. However, the frontal attack failed and they are now cooking up an outflanking maneuver.

Jesse Helms intends to put together a group of 34 senators who would vote against ratification of the treaty. This is because 67 of the Senate's total 100 members have to vote for ratification of the document, but if there is even only one vote less then the treaty will not be ratified. This is where Senator Helms' political arithmetic comes from. But what's the reason behind it? I think that a sufficiently full answer was given to this question by the Italian newspaper *Messaggero*. It said that the conservative wing of the Republican Party was so worried about the prospect of new and quick steps toward disarmament between the USSR and the United States that its representatives started a real propaganda attack on the current administration using every possible means. For fairness' sake, it has to be mentioned that President Reagan perhaps decided to mollify the pressure to a degree by resorting—as Viktor Nikolayevich has just said—to anti-Soviet rhetoric in a number of his latest speeches. To put it mildly, this, of course, seems out of tune with universally-accepted principles in the practice of international relations when, on the eve of a visit by the leader of another power, the hosts usually try to create the most favorable psychological climate which would promote positive results of the meeting. Well, one is led to believe that old political stereotypes that are at variance with the new thinking, new approach and new attitude to international affairs are again at work here. By the way, the same stereotypes could be felt obviously also in questions put by the NBC correspondent Tom Brokaw when he was interviewing Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev.

[Agayants] Yes, indeed, it would be impermissible naivety or even thoughtlessness to think that the upcoming meeting has no opponents and that in Washington everything would go smoothly, without a hitch. You have said, Boris Vasilyevich, that the ratification of the agreement would require a two thirds majority, that is support from 67 senators. It is difficult to forecast now how things will turn out in U.S. legislative bodies; yet it is known for certain—and you said abouot it in connection with Helms—that Republican ultraright-wingers, including Senator Stephen Syms from Idaho, famous for his thorough anti-Sovetism, are ready to give battle, that is to drag out the process of ratification as much as possible thorugh procrastinations, obstrucitons, the introduction of countless amendments and stipulations. Syms said that all attempts to attain arms control are nothing but a waste of time. With the purpose of poisoning the atmosphere of the summit the U.S. reaction intends to organize all sorts of anti-Soviet marches and demonstrations. The hackneyed myth of the Moscow threat is once again being dragged out into the light of day. Blunt anti-Sovetism is being whipped up.

Kremlinologist theorists of all kinds are hurrying to add their 2 cents worth. Thus, for example, Zbigniew Brzezinski, President Carter's former adviser on national security, has written a long article in the British newspaper *The Times* with the purpose of scaring West Euroepans. While acknowledging the importance of signing an agreement on medium- and shorter-range missiles, Brzezinski goes on again about Soviet superiority in conventional arms, and says that West Europe will have no peace until the Russians remove their tanks almost as far as the Urals. It is an old and hackeneyed tune! As Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev said in his NBC interview, we are prepared to sit down together at the negotiations table and examine conventional arms and troops the same way we did medium- and shorter-range missiles. We will be acting in a constructive way.

However, in my view, the genral background on the eve of the visit of the genral secretary of the CPSU Central Committee in the United States is formed not by the right-wingers or vociferous, unimportant anti-Sovietists but by sober-minded Americans who—as has been shown by recent opinion polls—are welcoming the Soviet-U.S. summit and wish it to be fully successfull.

[Levin] The thesis alleging that as a result of the liquidation of medium- and shorter-range missiles the Soviet threat to the West persists has found its reflection not only in what Brzezinski says but it is being repeated in many publications. Now and then things take a paradoxical turn. For example, the British newspaper *Sunday Telegraph* has published an article containing the following statement: NATO's intermediate nuclear forces did not represent a strategic response to the emergence of the SS-20 missiles. They were designed to neutralize the threat of the Soviet Union invading Western Europe with nonnuclear arms, and this threat is still in evidence. At first glance, this tirade contains a self-exposure. NATO circles have been maintaining all the time that Pershing-2 and cruise missiles were stationed allegedly in response to the installation of Soviet SS-20 missiles. Now they are saying something different, but this is not a self-exposure. This is an attempt to justify and to galvanize by every means the myth of Soviet threat, and numerous efforts are aimed at this including those of Brzezinski, who we have spoken about, and this article, and others could be added here too.

But in the pronouncement by FRG Foreign Minister Genscher, that I have already quoted, there is a point to which I would like to draw your attention once again. The double-zero solution, Genscher says, does not create a new risk but removes the one that already exists. When he says that this solution does not create a new risk, he obviously has precisely this talk in mind, the talk to the effect that, as a result of removing U.S. nuclear arms, USSR supreiority will allegedly increase again, superiority expressed in conventional arms, though, again, there is no such superiority either, and, I will repeat it, Reagan acknowledges this too, incidentally. This shows that the political atmosphere remains really very complex, and that those stereotypes of an ossified thinking, the stereotypes based on the myth of Soviet threat will, of course, make themselves felt. Perhaps, it will be difficult to refute these stereotypes by words, but the Soviet Union is currently refuting them by specific acts, by specific proposals and by specific decisions, and this creates the basis for mutually acceptable decisions.

[Andrianov] Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev's trip to Washington, his talks with President Reagan, the signing of the accord—which we do not doubt—the accord on liquidating medium- and shorter-range missiles, and the Soviet leader's address to the U.S. public will undoubtedly make a large breach in the wall of conservatism, narrow-mindedness and prejudices.

On the eve of his visit to Washington Comrade Gorbachev suggested: Let us think how we could act in the interests of the Soviet and American peoples to somehow improve bilateral relations and then, maybe, make them friendly, proceeding from the understanding that our countries are not only different but also interconnected.

Here, esteemed comrades listeners, we conclude our meeting at the round table. All the participants thank you for listening. Goodbye and all the best to you.

'Top Priority' on Summit Expectations

LD051326 Moscow in English to North America 0000 GMT 5 Dec 87

["Top Priority" program with Professor Radomir Bogdanov and Professor Sergey Plekhanov of Moscow's USA and Canada Studies Institute, presented by Pavel Kuznetsov]

[Text] [Kuznetsov] The summit starts on 7 November and the signing of the INF treaty is scheduled for 8 December, and I'd like to inform our listeners that right after the signing of the summit [as heard], perhaps on Wednesday, or so I believe, we'll have a speacial edition of *Top Priority* to discuss this history-making event in Soviet-American relations and which will have a very deep impact on international relations as a whole.

Now, a week leading to the summit saw several major speeches and statements by the Soviet and American leaders. First of all, Mikhail Gorbachev was interviewed by Tom Brokaw of NBC news, and President Reagan appeared, addressed the Heritage Foundation, and on Thursday the American President spoke with newsmen from four major American television networks. And I would like you two to share your feelings about what the two leaders said and perhaps to say whether they covered any new grounds.

[Bogdanov] Pavel, what is really matters [as heard], how it was perceived by the Americans. At the beginning you should have put your question in that way: What is the difference between Gorbachev's interview and President Reagan's speech at the Heritage Foundation?

[Kuznetsov] Okay, Prof Bogdanov, next time I'll make you host of *Top Priority* and you will be (? asking the questions, OK?)

[Bogdanov, amid laughter] No, no, I don't want to take your place, because you are doing it marvellously and I'm not able to do that. You know, honestly, I believe that, what is the basic difference between two speeches, you call, let them call speeches. [sentence as heard] President had to produce a kind of excuse, kind of explanation, humble explanation to his political pals why he is doing this and that...

[Kuznetsov] To conservatives.

[Bogdanov] To conservatives...

[Kuznetsov] That he is as tough as he used to be.

[Bogdanov] Yes. He was on, very much on the defensive. At the same time our leader's interview had no to excuse [as heard], he had to explain, he had to give arguments, he had to answer questions, that's the basic difference. I don't blame the President. I would rather say that I understand his difficulties. I understand the intricacies of the American political life. I don't blame him, no. I just accept (?him) as he is, as he is.

[Kuznetsov] Would you agree, Sergey, that President Reagan was split between his desire to please the conservatives and at the same time he could not ignore the widesread feelings of the majority of Americans who would like to improve relations?

[Plekhanov] Absolutely. There is something like a rebellion in the ranks of the conservatives. The more extreme conservatives are very unhappy about the prospects of a real breakthrough in Soviet-American relations, and this INF agreement and this summit have the potential of really putting Soviet-American relations in a different gear, toward different cooperation, away from this stale confrontation which we have had for quite a while. And they see their leader, whom they have supported all along, urging them to change course and to modify their view of international politics and of Soviet-American relations.

[Kuznetsov] Excuse me, excuse me. That I do understand because I hope that I know how the conservative mind in America works. But coming as it does on the very eve of the summit, this kind of rhetoric becomes an obvious political statement, doesn't it?

[Plekhanov] Oh yes, certainly.

[Kuznetsov] And since summits are not without some symbols about them it is very important. And, for example, talking to the four American television networks President Reagan said among other things that he had not changed since the time when he called us an evil empire. And this is, I think, this is a rather serious statement on his part.

[Plekhanov] Well, you know, I think a man can say that, but if he adds that the world has changed and he understands that, I'm perfectly all right, perfectly at ease with that kind of thing. You know, it's very very difficult to elicit a concession from an elderly person that he has changed his view. Of course, he would be very persistent in saying that he is just the same, but....

[Bogdanov, interrupting] In any case you can respect that.

[Plekhanov] Yes, sure, sure.

[Kuznetsov] Well, I agree with you that integrity in somebody is an asset.

[Bogdanov] It doesn't mean you agree with his views, but you respect his consistency.

[Plekhanov] And besides, you know, in the speeches that President Reagan has made recently—and there was another speech to high-school students in Jacksonville, Florida, where he answered questions about the Soviet Union and so on—I see traces of an evolution of views. The Soviet Union is changing, and any realistic politician has to register that.

[Kuznetsov] Before flying into Washington, DC, Mikhail Gorbachev will have a stop in London for talks with British Prime Minister Margaret Thatcher. And it is not just a stopover, but I would call it a mini-summit. Well, we used to call Margaret Thatcher the iron lady, and I think you will agree with me that Mikhail Gorbachev is not made of wax either. So, why this meeting is so important? Is is because Great Britain has been for some time playing the role of a go-between between the superpowers, or is it because the two leaders have developed a good deal of respect for each other?

[Bogdanov] Let me, Pavel, let me emphasize two points. Number one: USSR belongs to Europe. We are part of Europe, we are a part of the European Continent, and what is happening in that continent is of great concern to us, first of all in the security matter. [A] Soviet leader is going to Washington to sign the important treaty which does concern Europe....

[Plekhanov, interrupting] Including Britain.

[Bogdanov] Including Britain.

[Plekhanov] Some of the missiles are there.

[Bogdanov] Some of the missiles are there. By the way, this is the new sign, a very deep sign of the new thinking.

[Kuznetsov] On whose part?

[Bogdanov] On ours, on ours; and I believe on the British part too, because we have to pay its due to Britain too. The Soviet-American relations, with all its importance, it's not the beginning and end of everything. It's just a part of the larger structure of the international relations.

[Kuznetsov] Well, I think this INF treaty—and somebody else called it, some experts called it an international treaty, because it involves nine countries, seven of them are in Europe. [sentence as heard] And we also said that West Germany was a big help in resolving some of the sticky points of the INF negotiations between the United States and the Soviet Union, and now we have Great Britain playing a very sizeable role in that. So, would you believe that there's been some change in mentality in Western Europe? Are these perhaps the first signs, encouraging signs, that they are becoming more flexible on certain issues?

[Plekhanov] The important thing is, of course, that the Europeans, the Western Europeans and the Eastern European as well, including the Soviet Union, which is part of Eastern Europe, they are trying to work out new approaches to providing for their security. Europe is divided and the greatest peaceful confrontation, if you will, between the two military opposing blocks is here in Europe. And a huge amount of material and men are facing each other while there is no possible realistic scenario of them fighting each other, because, you know, the idea that there can be a war in Europe is out of this world. So that's just one indication that something's wrong with the current security situation in Europe, and that both sides of Europe should take a fresh look at the East-West relations, at the NATO-Warsaw Treaty relations, at the military balance, and so on and so forth. So it's about time that some new serious thinking were applied.

[Bogdanov] I believe that security problems in Europe are of common concern. They are not of NATO's or Warsaw Treaty's concern, this is a common concern.

[Plekhanov] That's right, a European concern.

[Bogdanov] It's a common concern. And sooner we get down to business, discussing all that, it's the better for all of us living in Europe.

[Kuznetsov] OK. Let's go back again to some unpleasant things. Bowing to vicious pressure from the far right, the American side canceled its own proposal for Mikhail Gorbachev to appear before a joint meeting of Congress. And on Wednesday there was this official American protest accusing us of a major technical violation of the ABM Treaty when two mobile radars were removed from, in, from an ABM test range and moved to the Ukraine. And as far as our experts are concerned they went on record as saying that the American side had been notified in advance of our move, that initially there were three such mobile radars and one of them was blown up, that is destroyed, and that what was moved to the Ukraine was nothing but vehicles with no instruments, nothing inside. And still they raised this problem officially, they went public with it. Now, I'm trying to....

[Bogdanov, interrupting] Pavel, I'm sorry, but they haven't reasoned it for us they know, their experts, they are very knowledgeable people, I respect them very much. What you are saying, you are saying not all that, not for them, you are saying that for our American listeners. They may not know all these details. But Pentagon and experts, they know all that. So I belive that that [laughs] very funny report about the alleged violations....

[Kuznetsov] No, I think it is very serious.

[Bogdanov] It's not....

[Kuznetsov, interrupting] Timed to coincide with this summit, then....

[Bogdanov, interrupting] I don't think it is.

[Kuznetsov] What do they want to achieve by going public with it? Is it to make us angry, to make us respond in (?time), to scuttle the summit?

[Bogdanov] I believe that we have nothing to do with that. It was done for their domestic consumption. For the games they are playing with their right, left, center. What worries me in all that, Pavel, what worries me in all that.

[Kuznetsov] Ok, what is it?

[Bogdanov] That administration engages in a very dangerous game. On one side they want to have a treaty, on the other side they are killing the (?perspectives) of the ratification of that treaty.

[Kuznetsov] Ok, but the same thing might happen in the future. When we come down to those 50% reductions they will come up with something similar, or take this adherence to the ABM treaty, they will do something, they will try to pull off something similar as well. So that is why I'm so concerned on this point.

[Plekhanov] Yeah, but you see the idea of putting forward such charges is not new. In fact, it happens on an annual basis, and this time it was done by the insistence of the U.S. Congress that the administration by early December should compile a report of Soviet compliance with the existing arms control treaties. We have the really pathetic, small-time stuff that they were able to bring up. There is just an illustration that there is no serious case that can be made against the Soviet Union in this respect, because what they are talking about is a couple of old trucks, half dismantled [words indistinct].

[Bogdanov] Sergey, what is very important in all that is that our side has invited the Americans to inspect all that.

[Plekhanov] Come and have a look!

[Bogdanov] Come and have a look! But the American side refused to do that, and they preferred to make it public.

[Plekhanov] Right, because otherwise...

[Bogdanov, interrupting] That's why I say, look, it's not serious, I smile at that.

[Kuznetsov] Ok, let's take a look at the brighter side of things. And according to a recent Gallup poll and some other public opinion polls twice as many Americans have a favorable, a positive view of our leader Mikhail Gorbachev as have an unfavorable view of him.

[Bogdanov] Before we come to that, let me come back to your first question about the Congress. It again is their domestic problem. Invite or not invite, to cancel or not to cancel, that is their sovereign right, let's put it that way. Where is the openness? American Congress is afraid of inviting Soviet leader. I don't credit too much....

[Kuznetsov, interrupting] and to hear him out, on glasnost and perestroyka.

[Bogdanov] To hear him out, glasnost and perestroyka.

[Kuznetsov] About our [word indistinct], ok. Where is their openess? I agree.

[Bogdanov] Yes, where is their openess, (?to each side the openess?)

[Kuznetsov] Yes, I agree with you. Let's go back to my question about those public opinion polls saying that Mikhail Gorbachev has become very popular with very many millions of Americans. Yes, he is a charismatic personality, he's very articulate and intellectual and very unyielding on principles, but beneath all that there must be something more important, and I think that this is a very great desire on the party of very many Americans to change their attitudes toward us, to accept us as equal partners in the joint undertakings to benefit the whole world. In his book *New Thinking for our Country and the Whole World*, which was published, incidentally, in the United States, Canada, and some othercountries, Mikhail Gorbachev says that there has been a little thaw in U.S.-Soviet realtions, but the process has been so far rather slow and painful, and that the most challenging problem is to break down mutual stereotypes. So what should we do to facilitate this? What are the key areas where we can achieve some progress?

[Plekhanov] I think we ought to be doing what we have been doing in the past 2 years: restructuring our country, democratizing our country, improving its economic system and pursuing openness, or glasnost as we call it, in all spheres of our public life. You know, the important thing which I think people in the world are beginning to understand is that the Soviets are doing all that not to please somebody else but because it is in the Soviets' own interests. It's in the interests of our own people. We are doing it because we need it. You see, there is another thing. People on both sides, both in the East and in the West, not to mention the rest of the world, are sick and tired of the cold war. I mean, this is a real anachronism. And the people are anxious to see ways to get out of the cold, to end it. And now they are feeling that with this kind of leadership in the Soviet Union and with the general political situation which is now coming to the fore in the world there is a chance.

[Kuznetsov] *Top Priority* goes on the air on Sunday [as heard] and will be a few hours, actually, from the start of the summit meeting, Soviet-American summit meeting, where an INF accord will be signed. Since we all know that it is going to happen, what is it that both of you expect from this summit? Very concisely.

[Bogdanov] My personal feeling is that INF agreement, as it is important, should be supplemented by an agreement on 50% cuts in the strategic offensive weapons, with the strengthening of the ABM Treaty.

[Kuznetsov] Agreement in principle so that President Reagan can come back to the Soviet Union next spring and sign it.

[Bogdanov] That's what I (? mean)

[Juznetsov] Your point of view, Sergey?

[Plekhanov] Yes, my hopes are roughly the same. I'm very hopeful that it will be possible not only to sign the INF but also to make a good....

[Kuznetsov, interrupting] Beginning on long-range arms.

[Plekhanov] Well, it's not just a beginning, you know, it's just, really an agreement in principle to put all the blocks together and form a structure so that President Reagan could com to Moscow. He will be very welcome here, and we hope that when he sees the Soviet Union it will, you know, have an impact on him.

[Kuznetsov] OK. Thank you very much, gentlemen, for coming to the studio. Our time is up. I'm Pavel Kuznetsov signing off on behalf of *Top Priority* and wishing you all the best and goodbye.

UN Official Views Summit as 'Breakthrough'

LD061750 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1530 GMT 6 Dec 87

[Correspondent Vladimir Dmitriyev—identified by screen caption—video report from Geneva; from the "Vremya" newscast]

[Text] [Dmitriyev] We are in the working study of Jan Maartenson, director general of the UN office in Geneva. Here diplomatic circles have been following attentively the Soviet-U.S. talks on disarmament. How does the United Nations in Geneva evaluate the Soviet-U.S. agreement on the elimination of two classes of nuclear missiles and the forthcoming Soviet-U.S. summit meeting in Washington?

[Maartenson, in English with superimposed Russian translation] This is a significant step forward in efforts to consolidate peace. I would say this is a real breakthrough in the field of monitoring and verification. All this, I hope, will contribute to the work of the Geneva conference on disarmament. We also hope that the leaders of the USSR and United States will be able to agree on further significant cuts in nuclear arms, first and foremost strategic offensive ones. I must say that in the framework of the United Nations I have worked for more than 7 years on the problems of disarmament. We attach great significance on the forthcoming new Soviet-U.S. dialogue at summit level. We believe that this dialogue will be productive and wish those taking part in it success.

Kashlev at East-West Seminar in W. Berlin

LD070145 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1814 GMT 6 Dec 87

[Text] West Berlin, 6 Dec TASS—Yuriy Borisov, a TASS correspondent, reports:

An international seminar has been held here on the theme of relations between East and West Europe and the state of affairs of the representatives participating in the Vienna CSCE meeting. The academics, diplomats, and journalists from fourteen European countries plus the United States who took part in the seminar noted the huge significance of the forthcoming Soviet-U.S. summit meeting and the signing of an agreement on medium- and shorter-range missiles for the positive development of the situation on the continent of Europe. The need was indicated for a successful conclusion to the Vienna meeting with balanced results in all directions—military and political, trade and economic, and humanitarian, and for the achievement of an agreement to hold a number of major pan-European conferences and forums in these spheres in the coming years.

In this respect, Yuriy Kashlev, the head of the USSR delegation to the Vienna meeting, drew attention to the proposal to hold a conference in Moscow on humanitarian cooperation, which would provide the all-European process with a new dimension, and which intensify its human factor.

Ryzhkov Receives UN Population Fund Chief

LD051519 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1410 GMT 5 Dec

[Text] Moscow, 5 Dec (TASS)—Nikolay Ryzhkov, chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers, received Nafis Sadik, deputy secretary general of the United Nations and executive director of the UN Fund for Population Activities, in the Kremlin today. During the talk, Nafis Sadik was informed that in the Soviet Union issues relating to raising the prosperity of the population are at the center of the social policy of the CPSU and the Soviet Government. It was pointed out that one of the main tasks of the restructuring being undertaken in the country is that of bringing about a qualitative upswing in improving the living conditions of the Soviet people. The goal of restructuring is to ensure economic, social, political, and legal conditions in which the Soviet people could in full measure fulfill their creative potential.

The chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers underlined that substantial resources needed to resolve the global problems facing mankind can be liberated by way of real disarmament. To this end the USSR has put forward at the united nations the idea of setting up a "Disarmament for Development" fund. In the event that this Soviet initiative is implemented, the UN Fund for Population Activities could evidently be a channel for distributing resources.

Nafis Sadik talked about the fund's diverse activities directed toward rendering aid to developing countries in order to resolve individual population-related socioeconomic problems, and also to organizations in the UN system for planning, forecasting and implementing population projects.

During discussion of the further develoment of cooperation between the Soviet Union and the UN Fund for population Activities, Nikolay Ryzhkov announced the Soviet government's decision that the USSR will become an official member of the fund, which will enable the USSR to expand its participation in the fund's activities. Nafis Sadik welcomed this decision.

Nafis Sadik presented Nikolay Ryzhkov with a jubilee desk clock to mark the birth of the 5 billionth inhabitant of the earth.

U.S. Government, Citizens Cited on Relations

Reagan IZVESTIYA Interview

PM041651 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 5 Dec 87 Morning Edition p 5

[Unattributed interview with President Reagan: "R. Reagan: We Should Continue Dialogue. IZVESTIYA Interview With U.S. President"; date and place of interview not specified]

[Text] Question: Mr President, this is your second interview with *Izvestiya.* M.S. Gorbachev will shortly arrive in Washington for another meeting with you. Do you think that in the period since the first Soviet-U.S. meeting in Geneva the world has become a slightly safer place and relations between our countries have changed somewhat for the better?

Answer: The world has certainly become a safer place, and the improvement of U.S.-Soviet relations has been and remains a contributing factor in this. Both sides subscribe to a policy of ever-expanding dialogue.

In the 2 years since General Secretary Gorbachev and I met in Geneva, our governments have jointly made significant progress in the spheres of arms reduction, human rights, and bilateral exchanges. The world welcomes this.

We Americans have continued to watch with great interest the efforts made in your country to implement reforms. We wish Soviet people success in all their endeavors to secure an improved quality of life and liberalization of the Soviet system.

Of course, this is primarily your own internal affair, but there can be no doubt that this also has international significance. This can help improve the international atmosphere and reduce tension. The U.S. political system is truly free; so we naturally sympathize with any progress in this direction anywhere.

The present development of events can only be regarded as positive; but there are still many problems. Mistrust and suspicion have grown over many years and are rooted both in history and in real aspects of our time. Forty years after the defeat of Hitler, Europe is still divided by artificial and inhumane barriers. In other parts of the world we are worried by the continuing occupation of Afghanistan and by your government's support for repressive regimes in Angola, Ethiopia, Nicaragua, Cambodia [Kambodzh], and elsewhere—regimes which wage war against their own peoples.

Nevertheless, I feel satisfaction at the fact that we have embarked on a dialogue that is being conducted frankly and covers the whole range of issues that concern—and often divide—our two countries. We should continue this dialogue and strengthen it in every possible way. This is the whole point of our meeting in Washington.

Question: The Soviet-U.S. accord on totally eliminating two types of nuclear weapons—medium-range missiles and operational-tactical missiles—stems from your talks with M.S. Gorbachev in Geneva and, still more, in Reykjavik. In your opinion, Mr President, what may be the significance of this agreement, which is important in itself, for the further process of nuclear disarmament?

Answer: The treaty on medium-range missiles is significant because, for the first time ever, the major nuclear powers have agreed on a reduction of nuclear arms, not merely on a limitation of their buildup. It removes an entire class of U.S. and Soviet medium-range nuclear weapons. This is, of course, the U.S. proposal that I put forward in 1981—the "zero option."

The treaty on medium-range missiles provides for the strictest system of verification [proverka] ever elaborated. We will no longer have to rely exclusively on national technical means of verification [proverka] since the treaty gives both sides the right to on-site inspection, including the right to inspection on demand wherever there may be grounds to suspect activity prohibited by the treaty.

Moreover, both the United States and the Soviet Union will maintain permanent inspectors at one of the missile plants in question on the territory of each of the two countries. This is a truly revolutionary concept, and it will strengthen confidence that the treaty is being observed. Even now the United States feels serious concern about the Soviet side's fulfillment of existing agreements concluded earlier. It is for this reason that the new approach is needed.

I hope that the medium-range missile treaty will prove to be a step along the path toward "glasnost" in Soviet military affairs. You must strive to inform your own citizens more extensively on military budgets, the structure of the Soviet Armed Forces, and the arms modernization program. This would help to strengthen the trust needed both for more substantial arms reductions and for the improvement of political relations.

The medium-range missile treaty is a good omen since it shows that through persistent work and a realistic approach we are capable of achieving positive results.

Question: Can we hope that the limitation of the arms race will not stop at the agreement on medium- and shorter-range missiles? The words from the Geneva joint statement with M.S. Gorbachev on the impermissibility of transferring the arms race to space come particularly to mind. How do you see the resolution of this task?

Answer: I do not have the slightest intention of stopping at the medium-range missile treaty. The United States and the Soviet Union have already agreed that they will seek the speediest conclusion of an agreement on a 50% reduction in U.S. and Soviet strategic nuclear weapons, as proposed by the United States.

Our foreign ministers agreed 30 October that there will be a detailed discussion at the Washington summit of the formulation of instructions to our representatives in Geneva conducting talks on a future agreement on a 50% reduction in strategic offensive weapons and subsequently on another agreement—on compliance with and nonwithdrawal from the ABM Treaty for an agreed term. Intensive negotiations on this question have been going on these last several weeks, and I feel optimistic. I hope that Mr Gorbachev and I will manage to achieve progress in Washington.

From the very beginning of my administration's term of office I have attached priority significance to substantial and fair reductions of strategic offensive weapons. Seeking to ensure that such an agreement really promotes the strengthening of strategic stability, we have invariably insisted that it provide for reductions and limitations on the number of warheads on ballistic missiles. These weapons are particularly dangerous and destabilizing because they are capable of hitting targets less than 30 minutes after launching. We will also continue to insist that such a treaty is susceptible to effective verification [proverka], and this is an exceptionally complex task. I am encouraged by the unprecedented scale of the verification [proverka] measures achieved within the framework of the medium-range missile treaty, but a START agreement (on strategic offensive arms reductions) would be even more far-reaching, of course. A substantial reduction in offensive weapons would make a considerable contribution to reducing the danger of nuclear attack. The same objective would also be served by further agreements in the sphere of strategic defense. I know that your government alleges that my Strategic Defense Initiative constitutes a destabilizing "militarization of space"; but, frankly, this is a gross distortion of the truth. The world will become a safer place if the two superpowers move toward strategic defense while at the same time drastically reducing their strategic offensive arsenals. Strategic defense can intercept enemy missiles but poses no threat to people. It allows a military strategy which avoids war by defending people instead of making them into targets. SDI is a research and development program to identify whether it is possible to ensure effective defense in the future using new advanced technology.

The entire world knows that the Soviet Union was the first to get into the field of strategic defense and started developing it long before I made my decision on SDI in 1983. In his recent speech on U.S. television General Secretary Gorbachev acknowledged that the Soviet side is carrying out the same research work as we are in the field of strategic defense. According to our calculations, in the last 10 years the Soviet Union has spent approximately the same amount from its military budget on strategic defense as on its strategic offensive forces. The long-standing Soviet programs in this field include the world's most extensive air and civil defense and the world's only operational ABM system, which is installed around Moscow and is currently being upgraded. Since both sides are fully determined to go on studying the latest strategic defense systems we propose a practical discussion of how—jointly and without endangering anybody—to make the transition to greater reliance on this kind of defense. This will strengthen our common security even more.

In addition to substantial reductions in strategic nuclear forces, we must also take steps to eliminate the dangerous lack of equilibrium in the sphere of conventional and chemical weapons, in which the Soviet Union has great advantages. This will be a complex process, since it directly affects our allies, and also because of the complex structure of the armed forces themselves. But I am pleased to state that both sides are expressing readiness to break the deadlock.

Question: The monstrous foreign debts of many developing states are one of the most dramatic and potentially dangerously explosive problems today. Many competent experts believe that this cannot have a happy ending. And, in general, if you look further afield, there is and can be no genuine security without resolving the problems of the developing world—not for anyone.

So, about the debts of developing countries. What ways can you see to resolve this problem?

Answer: In recent decades a more deep-seated phenomenon has been observed in the developing world, namely the flowering of those national economies which have managed to avoid the fettering effects of central planning and which have granted complete freedom to personal initiative and enterprise. For example, the economies of countries in the Asia and Pacific region are continuing to flourish, particularly in those countries where freedom of economic activity gives people a strong incentive to improve their living conditions. An acceleration of economic growth has also been observed recently in certain African countries, particularly in the sphere of agriculture, and this is happening as a result of easing the restrictions imposed by the system of central planning.

Foreign loans do not represent a problem in themselves. Countries need foreign and domestic capital for investments leading to economic growth and development. The United States and other successful industrially developed countries have ensured their well-being partly through an influx of foreign capital which finances plants, mines, and other enterprises essential for long-term economic growth. At present certain developing countries are experiencing difficulties in paying off their foreign debts because the funds they borrowed were used not as capital investments but to increase consumption and led to a drain on capital.

The United States still considers it correct to resolve this problem of debts by means of cooperation. Such a solution requires industrially developed and developing countries, commercial banks, and international financial establishments to act as partners. The United States has proposed a positive program which takes account of the need to raise the level of economic activity in developing countries.

The widening of sales markets for their goods remains one key to success in this sphere. Constant economic growth can be ensured only by broadening opportunities in a given country for displaying personal initiative and enterprise. The United States and our partners in the industrial world are making a vitally important contribution to this work by creating increasingly wide markets for sales of goods created in developing countries. Since World War II we have witnessed a striking shift toward ever greater interdependence among the national economies of different countries. In conjunction with political reforms which liberate man's creative potential a policy which encourages open competition and free trade is capable of creating favorable conditions under which industrially developed and developing countries will be able to resolve their economic problems and raise their peoples' living standards.

We are also aware that developing countries need special help to encourage economic development. No country has been as generous as America in giving assistance to other countries. In 1987 alone the U.S. Administration has made available approximately $9 billion for economic aid to developing countries and international financial establishments such as the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development and the IMF.

Question: Mr President, whereas your upcoming meeting with M.S. Gorbachev occupies first place among the international issues of interest to U.S. public opinion, among the domestic issues—we judge this from the U.S. press—the recent upheaval on the stock exchange and its consequences for Americans and the country's economy remain the number one topic. Please explain to our readers what, in your opinion, was the cause of that upheaval. How serious is it?

Answer: Allow me to say first of all that the U.S. economy is now stronger and healthier than ever. We are witnesses to the longest period of economic growth since World War II. At the present time the living standard of the average American is among the highest in the world.

Almost two-thirds of all American families own their homes. Americans drive 160 million cars; in other words, the proportion is 1.5 cars per driver. The overwhelming majority of Americans have their own telephones and television sets which, in most of the country, can receive programs from tens and at times hundreds of television stations. We are living through a very rapid development of science-intensive sectors which, among other things, gives consumers the chance to shop using computers without leaving home, and to enjoy stereo equipment using compact optical discs and modular telephones in cars. Mr Gorbachev will be able to see for himself the results of this continuing prosperity when he arrives in Washington.

Stock market prices today are at approximately the same level as throughout 1986, and that year saw the highest levels. The continuing high level of the value of shares and stocks means real financial prosperity for millions of Americans. More than 70% of American families receive interest payments from financial institutions, while one-fifth of American families own shares in private enterprises and shares in so-called general investment funds. Consequently, millions of ordinary people have a personal interest in their country's economic growth and prosperity.

It is important to understand the role played by stock markets in the world economy. Share ownership gives people the voting right to elect the boards of enterprises and the right to receive a share of their profits. Institutions like labor union pension funds also own and trade in shares for the benefit of millions of working people. This open markets system, built on the principle of enteprise and share ownership, is the reason why the average level of personal incomes in industrially developed noncommunist countries is 60% higher than in the Eastern Bloc countries. For that same reason, the per capita level of consumption in the United States is three times higher than in the Soviet Union—according to the most conservative estimates.

Periodical corrections taking the form of rising and falling share prices are a typical stock market feature. But participation in both the risk and the benefits involved in playing the market create a basis for the accumulation of wealth and the enhancement of living standards. With the market's help, anyone may develop an idea and acquire funds to implement it by setting up his own enterprise. Larger enterprises can attract the necessary capital only if they manage to convince the market of the economic expediency of their planned investments. The fact that our economy continued its healthy development during the recent period of stock market activity corrections goes to prove the strength of an economic system based on personal initiative and open competition.

Question: In your statements you have repeatedly raised the possibility of improving Soviet-U.S. relations depending on the Soviet Union's fulfillment of various demands, and have made complaints about our actual system. One could dispute the propriety and fairness of these demands and complaints. Our question is about something else: What, in your opinion, could and should be done by the United States itself to improve and develop relations between our countries?

Answer: You are not right when speaking about U.S. "demands." But who can doubt the interest of the entire international community in the changes taking place in the Soviet Union?

Furthermore, pledges by states are enshrined in international agreements like the Final Act of the Helsinki Conference and the Universal Declaration of Human Rights. The possibility of reforms and liberalization in your country is of interest to the whole world; we need to fully understand the dynamics of your society. The Western world and an increasing number of other countries have a well formulated and tested idea of democracy. Democracy means rule of law, a system of mutual dependence and mutual restrictions between legislative, executive, and judicial power which limits the power of the state and protects citizens' rights. Democracy means regular elections contested by different parties representing different political platforms and trying to gain the voters' trust and votes. Democracy demands the existence of an independent judicial authority which effectively protects legality and the citizens' inalienable right of freedom of speech, conscience, press, assembly, and religion. Americans jealously uphold our democratic system and we sincerely believe that every person in the world is entitled to claim freedom and all human and political rights. We are not trying to impose our system on others. But we cannot ignore the clear lessons of history, either. There are good grounds to expect that a country which respects the rights and freedoms of its own citizens would respect the rights and freedoms of other countries. This is why true peace and true freedom march hand in hand.

You ask what the United States can do to improve our relations? First, allow me to say that all Americans join me in wishing to improve relations. We know that our two systems—however much they differ—can and must coexist. We can, if necessary, coexist like two fighters in the ring. But we prefer to coexist as partners and friends. We therefore want to expand student, cultural, and personal exchanges, which lead to greater cooperation between our two countries.

Since General Secretary Gorbachev and I announced a new agreement on exchanges in Geneva 2 years ago, more than 100,000 Americans have visited the USSR in order to see and get to know your country. There have been many young people among these Americans. More of your citizens have visited America than ever before. But we would like 100,000 Soviet citizens from all sections of the population to visit America in the next few years so as to get to know us better. I think you have a saying: "Better to see once than to hear a hundred times."

I can assure you that I and my successors will continue to try to resolve the problems in our relations, approaching them realistically and constructively. We will support and strengthen the relations that have been established between us. The American people will be the same as they always have been: peace-loving, generous, and friendly, giving a hospitable welcome to visitors to our shores. In welcoming General Secretary Gorbachev and his delegation, we extend a hand to all Soviet people.

Network Interview Cited

PM041933 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 5 Dec 87 Second Edition p 5

[TASS report: "U.S. President Interviewed"]

[Text] Washington, 4 Dec—President Reagan has given an interview to U.S. television timed to coincide with the upcoming Soviet-U.S. summit. The questions put to the President reflected the complexity of the situation in the United States on the eve of the meeting. He was asked, in particular, how he regards the speeches by fellow thinkers from the extreme conservative circles against the conclusion of treaties with the Soviet Union and the development of relations between the two countries. For example, NBC's Tom Brokaw asked: Would the Reagan of old himself not have opposed a treaty on medium- and shorter-range missiles?

"No," the President replied, "because I believe that this treaty differs from everything undertaken earlier in arms talks between our two countries, if only because we have before us the first Soviet leader who has expressed a readiness to eliminate armaments which his country already has. As for whether this changes the military correlation of forces, you are absolutely right that in terms of conventional types of armaments, tanks, artillery, and so forth, the Soviet Union has a vast superiority over the NATO countries and over the United States as a NATO member. But there still remain many thousands of units of nuclear weapons, tactical weapons, battlefield weapons, and so on. Those selfsame types of arms that are being destroyed are, by their nature, such that if the Soviet Union were to use them they would strike not military targets but the capitals of all the European states."

Reagan added at this point that the next step after the conclusion of a treaty on medium- and shorter-range missles ought to be the resolution of the question on cutting back ICBM's by 50%. "These," he said, "are destabilizing types of armaments which terrorize the whole world. It is precisely these types of arms which threaten us with mutual destruction if they are ever used. It is enough to press a button and in 30 minutes terrible destruction will descend on our country or, if we are the ones to press the button, it will befall their country."

Reagan was asked whether he would be upset if next year he did not succeed in making a return visit to Moscow to sign a treaty on the 50% reduction in strategic arms.

"I would be very disappointed," Reagan answered, "but I do not think that this will happen. I believe that we will have a meeting in Moscow and I think that there is a reasonably good chance that we will take yet another gigantic step toward the elimination of nuclear weapons."

As regards the treaty on medium- and shorter-range missiles which has been prepared for signing, Reagan expressed confidence that despite the opposition of extreme right-wingers in Congress, this document will be ratified. "These attacks," he stressed, "are founded on ignorance of what is contained in the treaty and, in particular, on ignorance of the successes which have been achieved in the area of monitoring the observance of the treaty. Not one of the previously concluded treaties has been based to such a great extent on a system of monitoring, on-site inspection, and so forth, as this treaty has."

The opponents of the treaty, the President added, "think that the Soviet Union will somehow emerge with great advantages as a result of this treaty. But I have already explained that this is not so."

Answering the attacks of the opponents of the treaty, Reagan stated: "I think that some of those people who are most opposed to and who even refuse to accept the very idea of ever achieving any mutual understanding at all, whether they realize it or not, are those who in their heart of hearts proceed from the premise that war is inevitable and that war between the two superpowers must break out. However, I believe that if there is a possibility of striving for peace it is necessary to strive for it. But there will be no peace with capitulation. However, we have no intention of capitulating and we are not capitulating by signing a treaty which, as I have already said, is advantageous to all of us."

ABC representative Peter Jennings asked: "Many people are saying that you could help the withdrawl of Soviet troops from Afghanistan. Would you not, for instance, take upon yourself the commitment not to supply anti-government troops for 1 year if the Soviets pledge to leave Afgghanistan in that period?"

Reagan answered: "I do not think that we could do anything like that."

Reagan Discusses 'Joint Steps'

LD052029 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 2000 GMT 5 Dec

[Text] Washington, 5 Dec (TASS)—President Reagan has devoted his latest Saturday radio address to the country to his forthcoming summit meeting with M.S. Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee.

"Mr Gorbachev and I will be able to celebrate a joint achievement in the area of arms reduction—the signing of a treaty on the complete elimination of an entire class of U.S. and Soviet medium-range nuclear missiles. You will learn the details of this agreement in the days ahead. For now, just let me say that this is a good agreement which is fully in accordance with the long-term aims of the United States and our allies, and promotes the interests of peace," Ronald Reagan said.

"There are deep and fundamental differences between us and the Soviet Union," the U.S. President said. However, he stressed, "We must recognize our responsibility for safeguarding peace, and in particular for seeking areas where the United States and the Soviet Union can act together to reduce the threat of war. This summit meeting and the treaty do indeed represent joint steps to safeguard peace."

Shultz Supports Treaty

LD062021 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1940 GMT 6 Dec 87

[Text] New York, 6 December (TASS)—George Shultz, U.S. secretary of state, spoke in support of the Soviet-U.S. treaty to scrap medium and shorter-range missiles, which will be signed in Washington next week.

"I do not even feel the need to enter into polemics right now with the conservatives attacking President Reagan for the fact that he is going to sign this agreement," Shultz noted in an interview with the ABC television network today. "The Senate will be furnished with the text of the agreement and will study it properly. I myself am sure that after the senators do this, they will be satisfied that this is a good treaty and will support it."

"Unfortunately," the U.S. secretary of state pointed out, "one has to note that there are people here who believe that the difference between the social systems in the USSR and the United States is so great that it is not even worth trying to conduct talks or resolve matters. Personally, I believe that we should meet and should try to resolve problems. It is a fact that in the past 2-3 years we have achieved certain success in resolving problems."

"Our joint follow-up steps", George Shultz said, "are to achieve significant reductions in strategic armaments—a 50% reduction is a very desirable goal receiving broad support—and to reduce conventional armaments."

Further Shultz Comments

LD051335 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 0250 GMT 5 Dec

[Text] Washington, 5 Dec (TASS)—U.S. Secretary of State George Shultz has described relations between the United States and the USSR at the present stage as "substantive and full". He was addressing the Washington Council of World Affairs on Friday.

"At our time of global challenges and changes," he stressed, "the countries of the world are keeping an intent and searching eye on relations between the USSR and the United States. In the present period of deep historic changes, both the United States and the Soviet Union must make full use of all opportunities to change the hostile character of U.S.-Soviet relations for the better, both for the peoples of our two countries and for the whole world."

George Shultz gave a high assessment of the approaching Soviet-U.S. summit. "The greatest attention will be devoted to arms control," he stressed. "However, intense work in the sphere of human rights, the solution of conflicts in the whole world and efforts aimed at establishing more stable relations between our two great powers will be refelcted in the summit." The U.S. secretary of state noted that "new dynamism is being shown in relations between East and West" and that "a reexamination of old concepts" is going on in the USSR. He stated that the Soviet Union is "a leading scientific force...in the sphere of space science, various spheres of medical research, and theoretical disciplines."

USIA 'Propaganda' 'Nasty'

LD062046 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1800 GMT 6 Dec 87

[From the "Vremya" newscast; video talk by Valentin Zorin, identified by screen caption]

[Text] The U.S. public is awaiting with impatience and hope the arrival in the United States of Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev and his forthcoming important meetings and conversations with President Reagan. Being here in the United States for the past few days, we have seen this for ourselves. But we also see something else: Certain influential circles are now, on the eve of the meeting, trying in every way to poison the atmosphere. It seems particularly strange that even official circles, representatives of official authorities, are taking part in this nasty business. In particular, on the eve of the meeting the USIA, which is something like the U.S. ministry of propaganda, slipped to journalists who had arrived to cover the meeting in the U.S. capital—and there are hundreds of them—a collection of materials under the official seal of the U.S. Government. When you read it and see what it is about, you do not know whether to cry or laugh. There is such a malevolent anti-Soviet mishmash in this collection. [video shows booklet with title "President Ronald Reagan, General Secretary Mikhail Gorbachev, Washington Summit December 1987" and presidential seal]

Here is an assertion that it is none other than the Soviet Union which is hindering action on the conflicts in Nicaragua, Cambodia, Angola, and Afghanistan, an assertion about slave labor in the Soviet Union, and the completely preposterous statement that the Soviet Union carries out jamming of U.S. domestic radio broadcasts. All this is being done by the USIA, an organization that is always going on about the need to expand mutually advantageous friendly contacts with the Soviet Union.

Recently, in an address to U.S. schoolchildren, the President of the United States told fairy stories about the Soviet Union. All this, of course, does nothing to improve the atmosphere on the eve of the meeting. The new way of thinking is finding it hard, evidently, very hard, to break through in the U.S. capital.

Further on USIA

LD061944 Moscow TASS in English 1910 GMT 6 Dec 87

[Text] Washington December 6 TASS—By a TASS special correspondent:

When journalists, arriving here for the coverage of the Soviet-U.S. summit meeting, get accreditation they are handed on behalf of Charles Wick, director of the United States Information Agency (USIA), a kit of information material prepared by the administration's official services. Unfortunately, such "information" causes only the feeling of embarrassment and shame for its authors. It seems that not a single important moment in the Soviet Union's past or present was left undistorted in the materials of the kit. Incidentally, the official mark of USIA is used to repeat worn-out fabrications about the infringment of democracy and human rights and "violations" in the Soviet Union of agreements on disarmament, exchange of people, ideas and information.

The point at issue is not some detail, let alone a mistake. The American mass media noted that President Ronald Reagan, speaking in Florida a week before the beginning of the summit talks, resorted to tough rhetoric against the USSR. He, in particular, tried to accuse the Soviet Union of "aggression" throughout the world. As in previous statements, the President again told anti-Soviet anecdotes, which were dubious in taste and tact.

The USIA information kit was compiled exactly in this vein. More should be taken of the ungrounded and far-fetched allegations that the USSR was breaching agreements on a free exchange of information. [sentence as received] This is alleged at a time when news analysts in the USA and other countries of the world are unanimous that openness has become the norm of Soviet policy and that the American mass media can do well to undertake the same restructuring. The accusations against the Soviet Union, apparently, aim at consolidating the superior position of the USA in the field of radio propaganda in other countries, which it has been creating for decades by implanting networks of radio stations all over the world.

If this matter concerned the advertisement-style propaganda of the policy of the United States, one could discard this forgery despite its indiscretion and the obvious lack of conscientiousness on the part of its authors. However, when American Government agencies engage in such "activities," this cannot but cause indignation and concern. Whatever reservations are being made, it seems that the kit pursues only one goal of prompting an unobjective and biased coverage of Soviet policies by the world journalistic corps. The very fact of the massive distribution of such "information" on the eve of the summit meeting shows how difficult it is to deal with the American side on fair terms.

Warnke Interviewed on Prospects

LD061746 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1600 GMT 6 Dec 87

[Vladimir Gerasichev report from Washington]

[Text] The U.S. capital on the eve of the summit meeting: Today, Sunday, the center of Washington looks unusually lively. Usually on a Sunday these are clean, empty streets with a few tourists wandering about in search of museums and distractions. Today the White House, State Department, the National Press Club and Soviet Embassy are literally surrounded by photo and cinema reporters and arriving and departing cars. Here the last hours of busy and careful preparation for the reception of the lofty guest are in progress. Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev arrives in Washington tomorrow, but today the hosts say that everything is practically ready, and journalists are sharing the most advantageous places for covering the ceremony of the arrival of Comrade Gorbachev and the meeting outside the White House. Everyone wants to be first, everyone is afraid of missing something of the meeting which promises to be a historic one. Also looking forward to the meeting are ordinary Americans who are hoping for an improvement of Soviet-U.S. relations; that in Washington a big step will be made toward halting the arms race; and that a treaty will be signed on liquidating a whole class of nuclear missile weapons. The experts are also hopeful, and are looking ahead and weighing what will be done in Washington on the level of achieving progress at the talks on reducing strategic offensive weapons. Here is the opinion of former director of the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency, Paul Warnke:

[Begin Warnke recording in English with superimposed Russian translation] My impression is that this is a man who is serious about trying to improve relations with the United States. [preceding sentence in English] I think Gorbachev is very serious in his attitude about the plan for improving relations with the United States. The Soviet leader attaches great importance to progress in the field of arms control, and this cannot fail to have an effect overall on the development of our relations. I think the prospects for tomorrow's Soviet-U.S. meeting are good. The world will gain from a successful conduct of the talks. It is to be hoped that it will be possible also to make progress in the talks on reduction of strategic offensive weapons. [end recording]

[Gerasichev] But there are people who consider it necessary to speak in the language of ultimatum. Today they are holding their rally here, trying anything to cloud the atmosphere of the coming meeting. But the overwhelming majority of U.S. citizens, as a public opinion poll shows, favor limitation of nuclear missile arsenals and an improvement of relations with the Soviet Union.

INF Opponents Cited

PM041541 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 4 Dec 87 Second Edition p 5

[Special correspondents Ye. Grigoryev, T. Kolesnichenko, and V. Linnik dispatch under the rubric "On the Eve of the Meeting in Washington": "In Search of Truth"]

[Text] Washington—The countdown for the summit has started in the U.S. capital. Properly speaking, the debates have already begun. They were initiated by M.S. Gorbachev's interview with U.S. television. The interview is being widely discussed in the country's mass media and political circles. The Soviet leader's statements are seen as an appeal for honest dialogue between the USSR and the United States. Many Americans understand that the search for mutual understanding, rather than confrontation, is the highway of Soviet-U.S. relations, that it is their future.

The first briefing given by Soviet experts attracted great interest. It took place at the National Press Club. The hope of the Soviet public that the upcoming dialogue at summit level will be crowned with success was expressed. Local journalists tried to find out our experts' attitude to the "sensation" launched in the U.S. press. Essentially it consists of M.S. Gorbachev allegedly having said that an SDI-type program is being developed in the USSR. It was necessary to recall what had actually been said. After all, it was a question of fundamental scientific research rather than plans to introduce new weapons in space.

In general there are many meetings with the press in Washington at the moment. *The Washington Post* tried to present it as the "briefings war." But is this what is at issue? It is obvious that rather than propaganda skirmishes, what is needed is objective information which does not distort the sides' stances.

Unfortunately, the Soviet stance is interpreted left, right, and center, inside out and upside down. Thus today, "by pure coincidence" we are assured, a report from the administration has been published which ascribes "violations" of the ABM Treaty to our country. The compilers of the report have not taken great trouble to get the facts right. But that is not the purpose of this publication. On the eve of the signing of the treaty on medium-range and operational-tactical missiles, the administration is afraid of being accused of spinelessness and by using this "tried and tested method" is trying to prove the contrary to local conservatives.

An ancient maxim says: The most difficult thing is to follow simple truths. Unquestionably, one such truth today is the understanding that nuclear war would spell the end of human civilization. Consequently it is necessary to eliminate this threat, it is necessary to rid the planet of nuclear weapons. Yet especially in the United States it is possible to see with what difficulty this truth is gaining ground in practical politics. No one wants a catastrophe, of course. But as for the missiles and nuclear charges, passions are running high.

The opponents of disarmament refuse to give way. Their arguments are more than familiar: They range from different versions on the theme of "Soviet expansionism" and the "evil empire" which cannot be trusted, to endlessly repeated accusations about violations of existing treaties which are another reason, they claim, why it is impossible to do business with the Soviet Union. There are people like A. Haig, former NATO supreme commander Europe and former U.S. secretary of state, who claims that a 50% reduction of strategic offensive arms should have come first and only then should the medium-range missiles have been tackled. But there are also those who do not try to dissemble and declare outright that the United States must have military superiority over the Soviet Union and that the world in general must rely on U.S. economic, psychological, and political strength, which is naturally based on military might.

We heard this kind of view at the American Security Council, for instance, where we were very politely received by the leader of this organization, John Fisher (he is also cochairman of the "Coalition for Peace Through Strength"). At present both the Council and the Coalition are trying to agitate the public because they believe that the expected Soviet-U.S. treaty is fraught with negative consequences for U.S. security. This cannot be disregarded since the membership of the American Security Council includes 227 members of the U.S. Congress. Mr Fisher told us that hundreds of thousands of appeals have already been sent out to citizens and that ultimately it will be millions. When we asked to be given reasons for the stance of the American Security Council, we heard the same old pseudoarguments dating back to the times of the "cold war" about "Soviet expansionism," about the need for the United States "to have more weapons" so that it can "defend freedom" should the need arise, and so on and so forth.

Although you could see the dome of the Capitol from the window of the small conference hall where we were talking, we might have been on another planet where no one had ever heard of the new political thinking, about the realistic factors of Soviet policy. Here nothing had changed. "If we take the path of disarmament," Fisher explained to us, "we will gradually arrive at total capitulation." The reason for this kind of logic was probably reflected in the color photographs which adorned the walls of the premises portraying many people with close links to the Pentagon and the arms business.

We asked Mr Fisher whether he truly believed what he was saying about "Soviet expansionism" and he answered that he was ready to swear on the Bible. It is evident that distrust, a confrontational style of thinking, and an inadequate response to the new phenomena in international life are still characteristic of a considerable section of the U.S. establishment. Hence the bitter struggle around the medium-range missiles which is being waged in Washington during these December days. True, it is also possible to feel the breath of the "presidential race" which is getting underway, the breath of next year's election struggle. However, its approach, in our view, is not the main reason that prompts certain political figures here to engage in truly ludicrous outpourings. It is obvious that right-wing circles in waging their campaign against the treaty on medium-range and operational-tactical missiles are trying above all to put up a "rampart" against further measures in the sphere of nuclear disarmament. The attempts to complicate the atmosphere prior to the Washington summit and to step up anti-Soviet campaigns and actions pursue the same aim.

All this cannot be separated from the political mores of the U.S. capital. However, let us not forget that there is also another Washington, a politically aware Washington, that there is a politically aware America. They recognize the reality of our time, they recognize the fact that the USSR and the United States can either survive together or perish together. Soviet-U.S. relations play a tremendous role in world politics, they affect the current international atmosphere, and ultimately also the environment. Words are no longer enough today. What is needed is specific joint actions by states with different social systems capable of paving mankind's way to a nuclear-free 21st century, to a world without weapons and wars.

Presummit Atmosphere

PM061533 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 5 Dec 87 Second Edition p 5

[Dispatch by correspondents V. Gan, Ye. Grigoryev, and T.Kolesnichenko under the rubric "On the Eve of the Washington Meeting": "How Can Relations Be Changed for the Better?"]

[Text] Washington 4 Dec—The question in the headline is currently being asked by Washington cab drivers, San Francisco dockworkers, New York office workers, West Virginia miners, and others. As each passing day brings the summit meeting closer television, radio, newspapers, and magazines here are devoting increasing attention to this topic.

To a certain extent the tone is being set by the White House itself. The upcoming talks were the main subject of the U.S. President's latest news conference here today. Unfortunately we cannot say that the stance expressed in his statements is unequivocally constructive.

Things are not as simple as all that, unfortunately. R. Reagan's news conference, which was seen by millions of Americans, showed yet again that the U.S. position is far from unequivocal, but contradictory across a broad scale—from consideration of the realities of the nuclear age to unsubstantiated claims to the role of world arbiter.

For example, the President, answering journalists' questions, advanced convincing arguments in favor of signing the treaty on medium- and shorter-range missiles and spoke about the impossibility of winning a nuclear missile war and the benefits of Soviet-U.S. dialogue.

At the same time his interview [as published] contained irritating banal allegations about the absence of democracy in the Soviet Union and "Moscow's nonobservance of human rights." It has to be said that the allegations of this kind were designed for the consumption of quite definite circles within the United States itself, where they are greeted "with applause."

We are talking first and foremost about those for whom the Soviet Union has always been and remains an "evil empire" standing in the path of "beautiful" America "chosen by God." Thus, the upcoming signing in Washington of the treaty on medium-range and operational-tactical missiles, like every compromise reached with the Soviet Union, is portrayed in these circles as virtually a sign of the U.S. side's "weakness." If you talk in that kind of political language you are hardly likely to hear what each other is saying.

There are also people here who are frankly frightened of the impression created by our country's constructive and open position on key problems of the age. Krauthammer, the author of a *Washington Post* article, bellows: "No more summits on U.S. soil. If such meetings are necessary, let them be held somewhere else, on neutral soil, in countries with a permanently lousy climate." This is how right-wing circles here are reacting hysterically to the almost daily and hourly growing understanding among Americans of the Soviet leadership's policy. This was obviously also worrying White House Press Secretary M. Fitzwater when he said that "this will not be a meeting of old friends, but a meeting of opponents."

At the same time thinking Americans are becoming increasingly aware that the Soviet Union and the United States and their leaders bear an increased and special responsibility for the fate of peace.

Our meeting with a living legend—83-year-old W. Fulbright, who for many years headed the Senate Foreign Relations Committee in the U.S. Congress—was a symbolic one. "At last I can happily say that a historic event is taking place before my very eyes," he stated. "For the first time a whole class of nuclear weapons is being eliminated. We were all waiting for a step like this from our administration. It is so essential. Not only relations between us but the entire world are changing. I look to the future with hope."

The office of House Speaker Jim Wright is located in the main building of the U.S. Congress. Having passed through two police checkpoints and threaded along a narrow corridor we finally got to a comfortable and discerningly furnished office. Its occupant shook hands amicably and invited us to sit down. "Many of us are awaiting M.S. Gorbachev's visit impatiently," Wright said. "A tremendous number of people in our country admire what is happening in the Soviet Union. Americans are intrigued by the changes, glasnost, and restructuring. It has caught their imagination. Many people wish the Soviet people well and hope they will achieve their peaceful objectives. Mikhail Gorbachev is very popular among many Americans. Most members of Congress would like to personally see and listen to him."

But, the speaker noted, there is "a very tiny minority, including some members of Congress, who adhere to relatively backward views and talk in retrograde terms. They cannot believe in the possibility of establishing peace. Some are even frightened at the prospect of the establishment of normal and good relations between the USSR and the United States. However, they do not represent the majority of our people and in no way constitute a majority of our legislators."

We asked Wright what he expects from the Soviet leader's visit and how he assesses its significance. "I believe and expect," he replied, "that a long-term influence will be exerted on relations between our countries' peoples. It will be a positive influence."

In the speaker's view, the medium-range missile treaty will be ratified by the Senate. He expressed the hope that this agreement will lead to further accords, primarily on the reduction of strategic arms and conventional weapons. "We in our country are up to our necks in budget problems. We have a very acute need to be able to redirect funds into objectives such as education, medical research and the struggle against disease, housing construction. This would benefit our entire people and also the entire world, which does not need mountains of arms," he said. In this connection Wright spoke highly of M.S. Gorbachev's interview with the NBC television company.

What can be done to improve Soviet-U.S. relations? The speaker has ideas of his own on this matter. Although some of them can be described as "traditional" for U.S. politicians—like "the legalization of unimpeded emigration" from the Soviet Union and "the demolition of the Berlin Wall"—the crux of his views was different—the need to develop cultural and scientific contacts and economic cooperation. "I can imagine what tremendous interest there would be in exchanges of teachers, academics, students, technological discoveries, and, of course," he added with a smile, "parliamentarians..."

We also had another interesting conversation—at the "Nuke Freeze" organization. Wew arrived there on the eve of a planned 5 December demonstration by U.S. antiwar forces to be called "Peace Bridge." One of the coordinators of this demonstration by the peace-loving public, Roriguez Ferrer, said: "Over 1,000 people will take part in the demonstration. It is being held on the initiative of organizations like Sane Freeze, the U.S. Peace Council, the National Gray Panthers, Women for

Peace, New Jewish Agenda, and others. From the morning the participants in this antiwar action will form a human chain between the White House and the USSR Embassy. This chain will symbolize a bridge of peace and mutual understanding between our countries' peoples."

Citizens Write to Gorbachev

PM062015 [Editorial Report] Moscow *Pravda* in Russian on 5 December 1987 in its Second Edition carries on page 4 a full-page feature under the headline "Hoping for Peace. Americans Write to M.S. Gorbachev." The bulk of the feature consists of, according to an editorial introduction, letters sent by Americans this year to CPSU Central Committee General Secretary Gorbachev. The letters, each bearing the names (or group descriptions) and originating addresses of the senders, and in many cases the senders' position or title, are grouped according to their content under a number of subheads enclosed within quotation marks and designed to encapsulate the sentiments expressed therein. In the order in which they appear in the feature the subheads read:

"A meeting we have waited for so much";

"May this be only the first step";

"We wish you success in restructuring";

"To know each other better";

"Welcome to the United States."

The editorial introduction to the feature runs as follows:

"In his recent interview given to the U.S. national television company NBC M.S. Gorbachev said: 'I want to tell you that I have received 80,000 letters from Americans this year already. This is one-third of the foreign mail arriving at the party's Central Committee. The letters are from the broadest circle of authors. There are letters from congressmen, there are letters from business people, there are many letters from scientists and representatives of the world of culture, and there are very many letters from young people.'

"Today *Pravda* is devoting this page to the letters the CPSU Central Committee general secretary was speaking about. Their number rose sharply following the announcement of the Soviet leader's visit to the United States. The forthcoming Soviet-U.S. meeting has evoked—spawned, one might say—an enormous stream of messages from the United States. It is clear from these letters—only a tiny portion of which are carried in the newspaper—that their authors recognize the exceptional importance of the meeting both for the peoples of the two countries and for all mankind, and are pinning great hopes on the treaty on the elimination of medium- and shorter-range missiles which is to be signed in Washington and on further steps toward disarmament. The letters are imbued with the alarm which very many Americans are experiencing as a result of the acuteness of the current international situation, the arms race in particular. Their content testifies to the fact that today's American is a person who is far from indifferent to the state of affairs in the world, one who is thinking of a life for himself and his children free of the nuclear menace.

"The letters demonstrate a serious, particular, maybe, unease concerning the state of Soviet-U.S. relations. In diverse ways and with diverse expressions they voice the desire for the improvement of these relations, for greater mutual understanding, for broader contacts and cooperation. A genuine interest in the changes taking place in our country is discernible, and such words as 'perestroyka' and 'glasnost,' having entered international usage, are even written in Russian in some of them. All this indicates that the 'image of the Soviet foe' cultivated for decades in the United States has today grown pretty dim, and that Americans want to know more of the truth about our country, to become more closely acquainted with the life of Soviet people.

"The letters have come from all over the United States, and—a distinctive feature—many have come from the 'heartland' of America. They are very different, these messages—just like the people who wrote them. But they have one common feature—the expression of sincere sentiments toward the USSR, the desire to take their own, albeit small, step in our direction. These same sentiments clearly also permeate the numerous invitations to the Soviet guest to visit this or that state, city, or family.

"In sending their letters to the general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee their American authors are essentially addressing themselves through him to the entire Soviet people."

Soviet Officials, Commentators Discuss Ties

Arbatov Discusses Summit

NC032155 Athens RIZOSPASTIS in Greek
3 Dec 87 p 33

["Exclusive" interview with Georgiy Arbatov, CPSU Central Committee member, by Yeoryios Litsos in Moscow; date not given]

[Text] [Litsos] Forty-two years have passed since the nuclear destruction of Hiroshima and Nagasaki and—for the first time in history—the Soviet Union and the United States have reached agreement on the abolition of an entire category of nuclear weapons.

How did the USSR and the United States arrive at such agreement?

[Arbatov] The more nuclear weapons were amassed, the more it became obvious that if war broke out it would be catastrophic for all mankind. Recent events in Grenada, the Falkland Islands, and so on have taught us that the use of military force does not bring about political results.

The road toward the appreciation of this truth was long and tortuous. The arms race had reached a dangerous point. The consequences of a "nuclear winter" led to a strong antinuclear movement among the public, which in the end affected politics as well.

Our country was the first to put forward a program for the complete abolition of nuclear arms by the end of the century. The expected agreement is the first step toward nuclear disarmament. It is a small step, but it is indicative.

[Litsos] Everything points to the likelihood of Mikhail Gorbachev and Ronald Reagan signing an agreement. If is to come into force, however, it must be ratified by the USSR Supreme Soviet and the U.S. Congress; but in the latter, as we know, it is not favored by all. When do you think the Congress will be able to ratify the agreement?

[Arbatov] It is too risky to attempt to forecast what U.S. policy will be. I have learned this in the 20 years that I have headed the United States and Canada Institute. Thus, I would not like to specify a date. But I think that if they approach the matter logically in the Congress, they will arrive at the conclusion that time is limited. The political diary in the United States is such that they should hurry, otherwise valuable time may be lost. If 3 or 4 months are lost for ratification, this may cost us 2 political years.

[Litsos] Many people in the West say that there is opposition to the agreement in the USSR too...

[Arbatov] Sometimes I am told that there is a military industry in the USSR too and consequently a military-industrial complex. I disagree completely with such a viewpoint. Our Army and our defense industry do not constitute a power with interests contrary to our national interests. I can say with certainty that there is unanimity regarding our foreign policy. None of the people I know in the government and the Defense Ministry have expressed any doubt regarding the expected agreement.

[Litsos] It is also being said that the United States is proceeding with the signing of the agreement because it will benefit more from it.

[Arbatov] Such a viewpoint does not correspond to reality. In recent years a number of changes have taken place in U.S. political life. U.S. public opinion, the government, and the Congress have begun to be aware of the existing danger and want to do something so that the uncontrolled arms race goes no further. If we do not assess the situation in this way then the talks will have no meaning. We start with a mutual interest. This exists on both sides, regardless of the differing assessments or mistakes that are being made.

One more thing. In 1980 President Reagan unreservedly advocated a position of strength "toward the Russians." He stated that talks with Moscow were not necessary, that military expenditure should be increased, and that agreements that had been signed should not be adhered to because they had "many inadequacies." However, in 1987, he himself wants to strengthen his political position in another way: conduct talks with the "Russians," plan a visit to Moscow, sign agreements with the USSR. I think this shows the great changes that are taking place in the world and which to a great extent are linked with the policy the USSR has been following for 2 and 1/2 years, a policy that not only utilizes existing possibilities but creates new opportunities for dialogue and agreements.

I am convinced that Gorbachev and the Soviet delegation will go to Washington determined to fully utilize these possibilities. We hope that the United States will take a similar approach.

Regarding the agreement itself, both parties have succeeded in finding the "ideal solution" to the question of balancing their interests so the agreement does not harm either the interests of the USSR or those of the United States.

[Litsos] To what extent does the perestroyka that is taking place in the USSR contribute to the promotion of the Soviet Union's political goals?

[Arbatov] Perestroyka has been proven to be an effective means for the abolition of stereotypes such as "the face of the enemy," "Soviet strategic threat," and so forth. However, I think that the West too needs perestroyka. As Gorbachev has stressed, life itself challenges both East and West equally. We can no longer live as we did in the past. The new realities oblige us to revise our viewpoints and positions.

[Litsos] The visit to Washington will be the first one in 14 years. What do you have to say about the program for the visit?

[Arbatov] The program for the visit is very hectic. The bulk of it will be taken up by the talks between the two leaders.

The fact that the meeting is taking place in Washington will afford more opportunities, in one form or another, to the Soviet leader to come into contact with the representatives of public opinion in the United States, although the time for this is very limited.

I would like to conclude with Gorbachev's words: "No previous U.s. Administration in recent decades has had such opportunities to do something to improve relations with the USSR."

Chervov Interviewed

LD042340 East Berlin Domestic Service in German 2110 GMT 4 Dec 87

[Text] On Monday Mikhail Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, will arrive in Washington for a summit meeting with U.S. President Ronald Reagan, to which the whole world is looking forward. In the days before the great event there is naturally a demand for the opinions of specialists of both sides, especially specialists in the disarmament sphere. Our special correspondent Klaus-Juergen Fischer spoke in Washington with Colonel General Nikolay Chervov, member of the Soviet delegation of experts and head of a directorate in the Defense Ministry.

[Begin recording] [Fischer] As a military man who has concerned himself for years with disarmament issues, what are you expecting from the forthcoming summit meeting?

[Chervov in Russian with superimposed German translation] First, I expect that the accord on the liquidation of medium- and shorter-range will be signed. According to this agreement, the medium-range missiles are to be eliminated within 3 years. The operational-tactical missiles, including those that are deployed in the GDR and the CSSR, must be liquidated within 18 months. These missiles will be brought to the Soviet Union and destroyed there by blowing up several missiles in a bundle without their warheads.

Secondly, there is the important question of the strategic offensive weapons. I hope that the leading personalities of the two countries can agree on key provisions of a future accord on halving these arms. There is here, among other things, the still unresolved problem of the (?lower) level for the individual strategic elements within the framework of 6,000 warheads on 1,600 carriers. Mikhail Gorbachev recently tabled a new proposal on this; the sides have drawn very close together already. I believe that the treatment of this question here in Washington can lead to a further coming together.

There is, of course also the issue of attitudes toward the ABM Treaty. Our position is that this treaty must be preserved and observed in the form in which it was signed in 1982. I believe that the leading politicians of our two countries will deal with this question from the point of view that no side withdraws from a treaty within an agreed period. If this can be clarified, the path is clear for a treaty on the 50% reduction of strategic offensive weapons.

[Fischer] You spoke of possibilities for a further convergence. Are new initiatives now to be expected from Mikhail Gorbachev in this connection?

[Chervov] At such meetings new initiatives can, of course, be tabled by both sides, including on the key question of strategic offensive weapons. In his NBC interview, Mikhail Gorbachev said that he would not be travelling to Washington with empty hands. One can, therefore, anticipate something on this matter in one respect or another. Yes, I am expecting something.

[Fischer] In commentaries here in the press and by politicians in the days before the summit meeting, the question of conventional arms and forces is being brought increasing to the fore. What is the stance of the Warsaw Treaty states on the reduction of these weapons?

[Chervov] On conventional weapons the Warsaw Treaty states have already tabled very many proposals, but so far, unfortunately, we have not received any positive reply. I can name the Budapest initiative for a 25% reduction of the land forces and the tactical air forces of the two sides. At the Berlin meeting of the Political Consultative Committee of the Warsaw Treaty the initiatives were submitted for a comparison of the military doctrines and on balancing disparities. It is above all a case of evening out asymetries through disarmament and not by counterarming. For example, the one who has fallen behind in one class of weapons should not increase his arms, but rather the one who has pressed ahead should disarm. The Warsaw Treaty is, at any rate, ready also to solve the question of the radical reduction of conventional forces and arms by both blocs. [end recording]

Charikov, Kolesnichenko

LD040937 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 0955 GMT 3 Dec 87

["From Geneva to Washington" program, presented by Commentator Igor Pavlovich Charikov, with Tomas Anatolyevich Kolesnichenko, member of the PRAVDA editorial board]

[Text] [Charikov] Hello there, comrades! A meeting of the leaders of the two great powers, the Soviet Union and the United States of America, will open in the U.S. capital in a few days' time, on 7 December. The path traversed to this meeting has not been so long in terms of time: The first meeting between Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev and Ronald Reagan took place in Geneva just over 2 years ago. Taking a retrospective look at these years, one can see what a vast amount of painstaking work has been conducted on the path from Geneva to Washington. Our discussion is devoted to precisely that subject.

The other participant, Tomas Anatolyevich Kolesnichenko, is precisely there, in Washington, at the moment, and this conversation took place shortly before his departure and was taped then. So, from Geneva to Washington. I am suggesting, Tomas Anatolyevich, that we start our discussion from the moment when the first A-bomb was created, thus opening the nuclear age for humanity with its numerous, as we know, problems.

[Kolesnichenko] The only thing we have seen since is the nuclear arms race, the development of new and increasingly dangerous means of mass destruction. Naturally, some attempts have also been made at curbing the strategic offensive armaments: you remember SALT I, SALT II, but to eliminate the already existing, as with an oxyacetylene cutter, to slice through the living tissue of missiles, so to speak, that seemed to be science fiction, a vision of a remote future. But now the treaty—it is referred to as accord for the time being, before it is made legally binding—that treaty is ready. One hundred and twenty pages of tightly spaced text plus protocols, a memorandum—about 200 pages altogether. Many will probably read those pages as the most compelling novel of the 20th century, especially military people. Very much indeed lies in these dispassionate pages of the official text. For some they represent the long years of associating themselves with the idea of force, a whole lifetime devoted to a cause, ruined plans, unfulfilled ambitions.

Virtually a few days ago, Lieutenant General Daniel Graham (retired)—he is one of those who actively oppose the treaty—so, virtually a few days ago, he said that with the signing of the operational-tactical missiles treaty, the bulk of the U.S. Armed Forces will go to the dogs.

But as far as we, people of the planet, as they say, are concerned, what matters for us is—and it is gratifying to repeat it yet another time—that the elimination of a whole class of nuclear weapons is in the offing.

[Charikov] Incidentally, Tomas Anatolyevich, I would like to interrupt you for a moment. We say class of weapons, operational-tactical range, medium-range. But does the range have any meaning of its own? After all, if a missile has got less far to fly, that does not make it less deadly? A propos, at a recent press conference at the USSR Foreign Ministry Press Center Major General Batenin spoke of the division of the nuclear missile armaments into classes being a pure convention. And it exists exclusively for the purpose of negotiations—to facilitate the process of reaching an agreement in a way, stage by stage.

[Kolesnichenko] Well, you know, on the one hand, I agree with that, of course. The point is that the class that is due to be eliminated only amounts to up to about 4% of the existing warheads, after all, and that is why, if it is singled out, so to speak, and then a full stop, it would clearly be too little.

[Charikov] Naturally!

[Kolesnichenko] But the great significance of it lies in the fact that it is, as they say, a real process, that is, the process of backing away from the abyss which humanity is approaching. That means that if we start with these missiles, the medium-range ones, we can, in fact, spread to other ranges. What is at the focus now, and we are probably going to discuss, is the strategic offensive weapons and the battlefield missiles of an even shorter range as well—all these nuclear weapons, from our point of view, should be destroyed. But when we say a whole class, we are speaking of the fact that a real step has been taken already. From this point of view it seems to me that this is important. It is also important because, by the way, you should not forget that this medium-range distance happens to have been the distance that suits us least, because it enables the U.S. Pershings, so to speak, to fly to our (?strategic) [word indistinct].

[Charikov] In immediate proximity to our borders.

[Kolesnichenko] Absolutely right, 6 or 7 minutes flight time. Now this will not be the case. So we can say straight out that our security is getting new guarantees, as they say, in this case. But I would like to note that the road to this agreement was very long, it was full of pitfalls even literally in recent days. But, judge for yourselves, it took three meetings between our foreign minister and Secretary of State Shultz literally in 1 month, basically to prepare the agreement, this accord, which is soon to become a treaty.

[Charikov] I'll interrupt you again. Journalists have, incidentally, noted that over the past 2 years the intensity of Soviet-U.S. contacts, at the highest level and at the foreign minister level, has increased considerably. They have calculated that Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev is meeting U.S. President Reagan for the third time in 2 years.

[Kolesnichenko] Of course, you have noted the trend most correctly. It has to be said that this started in Geneva. You see, it is not simply that we are now witness to, as you say, intensive meetings, these meetings were based on a special understanding in Geneva. So I would like to go back, so to speak, to our subject, from Geneva, as they say, to Washington. There were Soviet-U.S. meetings before, including at the highest level, and it must be said that we often put more hopes on them than, unfortunately, they yielded for us. You'll recall the spirit of Geneva of 1955 [as heard] that vanished into thin air, and it is, perhaps, very important that following the April plenum we reviewed a great deal in foreign policy. For example, we firmly understood that however great the prestige of the Soviet leadership might be, however warm the atmosphere at meetings with the United States might be, to the ruling class in the United States we have always been, and remained, some kind of devil incarnate, sticking in the throat of the splendid, God-chosen United States.

[Charikov] They have even called us the empire of evil.

[Kolesnichenko] The empire of evil, they called us that later, too. Every agreement signed with us, every compromise was presented as a manifestation of weakness on the part of the U.S. leadership, and so on. So, what did change in Geneva, what started in Geneva? At that time the U.S. side was not prepared to reach agreement, proceeding from realism and a sense of responsibility, on the radical proposals of the USSR. But the optimism with which I, for example, a journalist covering this meeting, and many other observers left Geneva in November 1985 was justified. It was justified because the most important thing was that a new dialogue had started, a special dialogue, in which we put forward the fundamental ideas of the new political thinking. We proceeded from the fact that Soviet-U.S. relations must be based on the principle of equal security for both sides. That was new and somwhat unexpected for the Americans, because prior to that each side would only talk of its own security; the more weapons I have, it assumed, the stronger I am.

Now, in the perspective of the new thinking, this kind of approach has already become obsolete, and the most important thing was that we proceeded at that time from the fact that if we did not succeed in starting a direct and frank [otkrovennyy] talk with the Americans now, tomorrow it would be 100 times more difficult, or even utterly impossible. This was a dialogue, a dialogue and not an attempt at delivering ultimatums on our part which, I would also like to note, is also an important aspect of Geneva. I read a very interesting sentence from Lenin: Delivering ultimatums, he warned, eases the situation of our adversaries—we shall show all conditions to the people. Delivering ultimatums can be ruinous to our entire cause, and if you look at our demands in Geneva you'll simply be astounded at how far we have moved from them, based on sensible compromise and concessions, not to the U.S. side but to common sense. If you recall, say, our demands to link the medium-range missile problem with the nuclear arsenals of France and Britain, these were just claims, and would be just today, too.

But the compromise, the art of conducting a dialogue, I would even say an art of diplomacy, lied in concentrating attention on the main area. I think that this problem, at any rate, is going to receive some coverage in the future, and the fact that we removed it from the main area has enabled us to arrive at such an important treaty as this.

Therefore, in Geneva, we can sum it up and say that the foundations for the new practical line of a new political thinking, a new diplomacy were laid there.

Then we come to October 1986, Reykjavik.

[Charikov] You were there as well, Tomas Anatolyevich, covering that summit, right?

[Kolesnichenko] Yes, I was able to live through a few very unforgettable days, of course, because the summit was to such an extent unpredictable, unfathomable and enthralling that I don't think anyone slept there, neither journalists nor diplomats, let alone members of the delegations—them definitely. They had sessions virtually around the clock. The results were so interesting and so far-reaching that that summit in Reykjavik has not been fully assessed historically yet, I believe that historians will come back to it. That is because what happened there was that the new thinking, the ideas of which were generated in Geneva, started taking on an infrastructure, a specific outline, there in the Icelandic capital.

Boldness, innovative attitudes, a creative quest rejecting any banal approaches to the talks, as displayed by the Soviet side in Reykjavik, led to the situation where both the USSR and the United States found themselves close—as you remember—to truly historic decisions of an unprecedented scale. It was precisely the new thinking that has taken the form of the new diplomacy which led to embarkation on the subject of eliminating medium-range missiles and to the adoption of the agreement in principle of a 50% cut in strategic offensive weapons.

[Charikov] In other words, the accords that have already virtually materialized?

[Kolesnichenko] The first part has materialized. But, as you have just noted, in Washington—we are, apparently, going to turn to that in a moment—in Washington, the principal and, perhaps, the most interesting and dramatic part of it will be precisely a discussion of this 50% cut in strategic offensive armaments. That is because, as Mikhail Sergeyevich recently stressed, we agreed on it in Reykjavik already, and let us go further now, you understand. The operational-tactical missile is yesterday's issue. Let us go further—that is very interesting.

[Charikov] Discussion about the 50% cut, is this not going to entail discussion of the issue of the Strategic Defense Initiative?

[Kolesnichenko] But of course. As a matter of fact, if you remember that when the two sides in Reykjavik reached those heights, so to speak, and reached for the pinnacle—elimination of the strategic offensive armaments—the U.S. delegation felt dizzy, figuratively speaking, and failed to reach the peak. It was precisely at that moment that it emerged clearly that the Strategic Defense Initiative is the main obstacle impeding further progress along the path of mutual understanding and the elimination of the strategic offensive armaments.

One must say that the issue of the attitudes toward the ABM Treaty, the Antiballistic Missile Treaty, was first posed there. We have formulated the issue in the following way: When eliminating strategic offensive armaments, naturally, under conditions where we are eliminating nuclear weapons, what is needed is to strengthen the ABM Treaty, to turn it into an firm basis, so to speak, of Soviet-U.S. relations. Naturally, the question of observance emerged there, of how many years—it is without time-limit, after all, right.

[Charikov] Without a time limit, that's right.

[Kolesnichenko] Right, well, of how many years to remain within the treaty, and so forth. In Washington now, as your question correctly implied, the chief problem will be the ABM Treaty. Here we may be able to find a reasonable compromise and determine the time scale, but I think that one thing is utterly clear: We have stood, and will always stand, first of all for the nonmilitarization of space—we will oppose weapons being put into space—and we will stand as clearly as possible for the observance of the ABM Treaty. Reagan recently said that he was learning Russian proverbs in advance of Mikhail Sergeyevich's arrival, and he learnt the proverb: Trust people, but check what they do all the same [doveryay no proveryay]. That was supposed to be about monitoring. But the interesting thing is that recently it is we who have been saying that monitoring, on-site and in every respect, should be very strict. In other words, we too are in favor of monitoring, and I would go further than saying we too—I would say we primarily.

[Charikov] More strongly.

[Kolesnichenko] More strongly. But so far what we have been hearing from the U.S. side are things like: But will there be any verification? Certain senators and congressmen who oppose the operational-tactical missile treaty and who don't like the talks on a 50% reduction in strategic offensive arms keep saying: But what about verification? We'll just see whether the proper verification will be carried out. But that's our starting point too: What we are saying is that without verification we won't accept the treaties either.

[Charikov] But that's just rhetoric which became devalued a long time ago. At one time they were using it as a trump card, when these questions of monitoring and verification really were difficult to agree on, or were agreed on with difficulty. Now there are no objections from our side, and I think that this issue is just hanging in mid-air: It no longer brings the political dividends to the opponents of these accords that it did before.

[Kolesnichenko] I agree absolutely that this issue is of no importance, but what I have to say is that inside the United States it does have an effect because the people there are being very poorly informed about what our opinion is, because many of the opinion polls show that Americans think we are against monitoring. Though on the contrary, as you said yourself, we are for monitoring.

[Charikov] Yes, but that's a slightly different subject. We don't have time to deal with that as well. We could also...

[Kolesnichenko—interrupting] Yes, excuse me. Yes, it's a different subject, but on the subject of the Washington meeting, and about Geneva, Reykjavik, and Washington, it should be said that all those talks, dramatic and difficult talks, all break through a wall of resistance from reactionary circles, right-wing circles. Look at the strange situation evolving now in Washington: The nearer the date of the visit by Comrade Gorbachev, the more insistent and loud are the voices of the right-wingers, who are even saying that the treaty on operational-tactical and medium-range missiles will not be ratified in the Senate, that there is no point in a treaty with the Russians at all, that there is no point in trusting them because they break treaties, and so forth. This campaign points to the fact that nothing will be automatic or simple there, and that we can't expect the days our delegation will spend there to be a nice and easy visit to the Potomac. I think that it will unfortunately be a very crucial struggle and, I would say, exhausting talks, and a lot of effort will have to be made to ensure that they go along the channel that we would like.

Sagdeyev in Washington

LD051317 Moscow Television Service in Russian 2013 GMT 4 Dec 87

[From "special edition" of "The World Today" program; interview with Academician Sagdeyev by special correspondent Eduard Sorkin in Washington—date not given; recorded]

[Text] [Video shows U.S. space museum] [Sorkin] This is how the champions of Star Wars regard SDI. Here is the opinion of a specialist. Academician Sagdeyev is one of the group of Soviet experts who has come to Washington. Let's talk a bit about SDI. What is your view: Does Reagan's Strategic Defense Initiative constitute a real danger to the Soviet Union?

[Sagdeyev] I would answer that question like this: It undoubtedly does constitute a danger, but it constitutes a danger to the United States as well, to exactly the same degree. We live in a mutually-dependent world, and every attempt to shatter the strategic balance by any of the participants in this confrontation, this nuclear confrontation, will without fail lead to the opposing side taking its own measures. As a result, both participants, if one can put it like that, in the arms race, are in a far more disadvantageous, unstable postion.

If one of the sides spends resources on SDI, the other side will be compelled to seek counter measures, as Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev said in his NBC interview. I think it is precisely this arms race which is dangerous for both sides. I hope that this meeting will nevertheless offer opportunities to avoid such a race. But if it comes about, then one must take into account the fact that technology has its reverse side, namely the technology for countermeasures—these are two Siamese twins which cannot be separated from one another. But the technology of counter measures is considerably cheaper.

[Sorokin] Now, in the long term, in the future, can the plan for Star Peace and the Star Wars program develop simultaneously, or does one exclude the other?

[Sagdeyev] It seems to me to be very difficult to combine these two lines. It is not that developing a military program, the SDI program, will lead to some legislative act, a ban on peaceful work in space. The fact is simply that the militarization of space and the great spending on this program will gradually lead to peaceful programs in space being wound up, and being gradually stifled.

[Sorokin] Or, to quote Schiller, where Brutus lives, Caesar cannot.

Lukashuk Views Relations

LD031604 Moscow TASS in English 1525 GMT 3 Dec 87

[Text] Moscow December 3 TASS—Igor Lukashuk, professor of the Institute of State and Law, called a chance to conclude a treaty between the USSR and the USA on liquidating intermediate- and shorter-range nuclear missiles a breakthrough into a new sphere of international law. He takes part in the international conference "Neoglobalism and International Law", now in progress in the Soviet capital.

"A whole class of weapons will be destroyed for the first time in mankind's history," the scientist told TASS. "To my mind, it is not only a treaty to be concluded at the Soviet-American summit that is important. It has worldwide importance from the viewpoint of prospects for legal ensurance of security in the world."

Igor Lukashuk believes that if the first agreement on elimination of missiles is reached, in the near future it will be followed by new understandings on cutting and liquidating other classes of nuclear and conventional weapons, whose participants will include the USSR and the USA as well as other countries.

The conclusion of an INF treaty will confirm a possibility of achieving efficient agreements in the sphere of international security, including disarmament. "It is an open secret that when the USSR put forth a programme of general disarmament even before the start of the Second World War, our lawyers and diplomats were accused in the West of political idealism," noted Lukashuk.

"A top-level agreement," the scientist said, "will give an impetus to the development of confidence and security in the world and will help the earlier-concluded acts function more efficiently. International law and order will rise to a new level."

Caution on 'Wishful Thinking'

LD041124 Moscow TASS in English 0630 GMT 4 Dec 87

[Text] Washington December 4 TASS—TASS special correspondents Aleksandr Belikov, Nikolay Turkatenko, Vitaliy Chukseyev and Gennadiy Shishkin report:

Going to a summit meeting in Washington, the Soviet Union proceeds from the premise that the centerpiece of its initiatives for security and disarmament is the proposal for both sides to halve their strategic offensive arms, while observing and reinforcing the ABM Treaty and keeping weapons out of space, and other militarily significant measures suggested to the American side.

Most Democratic and Republican presidential hopefuls support the planned Soviet-U.S. agreement on eliminating intermediate-range and shorter-range missiles to be signed during the summit.

It is obvious at the same time that in the U.S. leadership there still are very influential elements that would like to continue pursuing a position-of-strength policy vis-a-vis the Soviet Union and seeking to win unilateral concessions from it.

In Washington, however, they are engaging in wishful thinking if they believe that the constructive Soviet approach to relations with the United States and the summit meeting means that the USSR is giving up its policy of principle and its line of issuing a decisive rebuff to any aggressive scheming by the American leadership.

One may rest assured that any attempt by the United States to take advantage of work to prepare the summit to camouflage its military preparations and aggressive actions will draw a befitting response.

The Soviet Union regards it as its task in a businesslike and constructive spirit to raise with the American leadership once again the issue of finding mutually acceptable solutions to the whole gamut of problems which are decisive to limiting and reducing nuclear arms, preventing outer space militarization, banning chemical warfare agents, reducing conventional weapons to the level of reasonable sufficiency, and taking other important steps to ensure world peace.

The coming signing of the Soviet-American agreement on intermediate-range and shorter-range missiles in Washington will have immense significance of its own.

It will be the first major agreement in the field of real disarmament between the Soviet Union and the United States for eight years.

Although formally it will be a Soviet-American treaty, it will effectively have an international nature as nuclear systems will be eliminated in the territories of nine countries.

And it will be a first agreement affirming the feasibility and possibility of creating a nuclear-free and safer world.

Sizing up the significance of the forthcoming Soviet-U.S. summit, the progressive American public calls attention to the fact that the Soviet leadership's unwavering line of peace is reflected in the new manner of thinking and open style of foreign-policy activities adopted by the Soviet Union, a style based on [words indistinct] and seeking to win unilateral concessions from it.

In Washington, however, they are engaging in wishful thinking if they believe that the constructive Soviet approach to [words indistinct] they also meet the long-term interests of the entire world community and open up new prospects for cooperation in both economic and political fields.

Pozner Assails Right Wing

LD041356 Moscow in English to North America 2300 GMT 3 Nov 87

[Text] Vladimir Pozner sent in this dispatch from Washington devoted to the coming summit and here is what he writes:

Summit fever moves toward a red hot mark here in Washington as the day of Mikhail Gorbachev's arrival moves closer and closer. Expectations of what this summit may achieve run high. But while this warms the heart of most Americans, it chills those of the ultra-right.

The conservative steamroller that flattened the ratification of SALT II at the end of the 1970's and smoothed the way for the acceptance of the Strategic Defense Initiative in the early eighties is no longer coasting. It was badly jarred first by Geneva and then even harder by Reykjavik.

The upcoming summit could well make it come to a grinding stop. Hence the frenzied activities of such right-wing bastions as the Heritage Foundation and the Committee on the Present Danger.

Much has been said in connection with that, about the fact that General Secretary Gorbachev will not be allowed to address a joint meeting of both houses of the United States Congress.

Permit me to share my views on that subject. To begin with, that decision was pathetic, childish, and foolish. It reflects the immature, insecure, and ugly minds of America's right wing, and historic will qualify it as a blemish, something Americans of tomorrow will look back on in shame.

But no matter how stupid and unworthy the act, it had a certain goal, and that goal was to scuttle the summit. The rightwing strategy was to insult the Soviet leader with hope that he would then slam the door in a huff and call off the visit.

The strategy was based on old thinking, and more specifically on the help of tit-for-tat retaliatory psyche that so typifies the ultra-conservative mind. It was based on the understanding of how that mind would react to such an insult.

What the strategists of the far right failed and fail to comprehend is new thinking. It is beyond their total mental facilities. The Soviet leadership refused to react, refused to sacrifice this unique opportunity to achieve a breakthrough in United States-Soviet relations, to serve the interests of both nations and of the world, in favor of satisfying the egoistic desire of wounded pride. That strategy failed and failed miserably.

The summit remains intact while the arch-conservatives are left to enjoy what is at best a paltry and hollow triumph. In this reporters opinion, the ultra-right is making its own Custer's Last Stand. It cannot stop the signing of the INF treaty, nor will it be able to block its ratification. And while it will simply hinder as much as it can the process of Soviet-United States agreements in the crucial area of arms reduction, it no longer has the power to stop, let alone reverse that trend.

Yes, today the right wing continues to loudly beat its own war drums, but the sound is hollow, and time now marches to another beat.

Zorin: 'Positive Results'

LD051504 Moscow World Service in English 1410 GMT 5 Dec 87

[Valentin Zorin commentary]

[Text] I am sending my commentary from Washington, where I came to cover the forthcoming meeting between General Secretary Mikhail Gorbachev and President Reagan, writes Valentin Zorin. Here politicians of various convictions are unanimous in believing that the Gorbachev-Reagan summit is due to become an event of historic importance. I would not exaggerate, I think, if I say that the entire history of humanity is to a large degree a history of how people developed and accumulated new and new masses of weaponry, from stone cudgels to intercontinental ballistic missiles. Today we are about to witness how humanity is going to make a reverse step for the first time by agreeing to destroy part, a small part so far, of its weaponry arsenals. The step is significant not for the quantity of weapons subject to destruction but for the launching of an entirely new trend in the political activities of mankind.

Here in Washington I talk to many of its residents—senators, journalists and ordinary folk, men in the street, as they say. I ask them about the impression that Mikhail Gorbachev's interview given to the American NBC television network produced on them. Not all with whom I talked accept the arguments by the Soviet leader, but none of these people denied him such qualities as goodwill and a determination to agree to radical measures for the purpose of reducing weaponry arsenals.

To my mind, there are at least three factors that have led to Washington's decision to face up to the agreement and make the forthcoming summit possible. The first is the constructive and active policy of the Soviet Union, who demonstrates not in words but in deeds its goodwill and whose policy wins increasing support in the world. As far as I can judge, being here in Washington, Gorbachev's line is popular enough in the United States. The American leadership has to take this into consideration, especially now in a pre-election year. The second factor bringing about a change in political sentiments of the American Administration is the increasing realization of the fact that nuclear war will be disastrous to all. And finally, economic considerations should not be overlooked either. The United States has been getting more and more aware of the excessive burden that the unprecedented arms race puts on its economy. The state debt approaching $3 trillion cannot help but cause the most serious alarm of leading businessmen and politicians. A further increase in the spending on arms threatens to cause an economic upheaval. Pressed by its rivals from Japan and Western Europe, the United States today begins losing its positions on the world market. Under these circumstances the curtailment in military expenditures becomes even more necessary.

Now, watching the final preparations for the meeting, I feel inclined to think about it in optimistic terms. I believe the Soviet-American summit will yield positive results.

That was a report from Washington by Political Observer Dr Valentin Zorin.

Bogdanov: 'Optimism'

LD061008 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 0700 GMT 6 Dec 87

[Interview with Doctor of Historical Sciences Radomir Bogdanov]

[Text] The meeting between the leaders of the Soviet Union and the United States, which begins tomorrow in Washington, is the subject of an interview given to All-Union Radio by Doctor of Historical Sciences Radomir Bogdanov, deputy director of the United States of America and Canada Institute of the USSR Academy of Sciences.

[Begin Bogdanov recording] Since only a few hours are left before the start of the meeting, it is always difficult in such a situation to answer questions, especially if a question contains some element of forecasting. The working out of the treaty on the elimination of medium- and shorter-range missiles has been completed. Highly detailed procedures for verifying [proverki] compliance with the treaty have been woked out. The sides are also ready to discuss other questions that form an important part of Soviet-U.S. relations, including regional problems, the so-called human rights, and other matters.

But there is a central problem in Soviet-U.S. relations: the problem of strategic offensive weapons. Since this problem is central, what will happen in solving this problem will probably largely determine the result of the meeting. It is a question of the possible elimination of 50% of strategic offensive weapons with the simultaneous strengthening of the 1972 ABM Treaty. We shall hope that very good prerequisites have been created for progress in that direction. It is necessary now only to move forward.

I should have been surprised if the right-wing or conservative, or ultra-conservative, as they are sometimes called, forces had not stirred. Throughout the history of Soviet-U.S. relations, it has already happened on more than one occasion that, when major breakthroughs, major solutions to deadlocked situations in Soviet-U.S. relations were possible, it always led to the mobilization of those forces that, as a matter of principle, oppose any improvement in Soviet-U.S. relations. Who will prevail? I have grounds for optimism, and I think that the realistic forces that favor an improvement, a straightening-out of Soviet-U.S. relations, and favor this treaty possess enough potential to see that Senate ratification of the treaty ultimately takes place and everything goes as it should. [end recording]

Bogachev on U.S. Violations

LD061020 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1030 GMT 5 Dec 87

[Vladimir Bogachev commentary; from the "International Diary" program, presented by Sergey Fanton]

[Text] The realistic prospects for the conclusion of an effective Soviet-U.S. agreement on the total elimination of two classes of nuclear missiles is attracting the attention of representatives of the most varied spheres of the international public. Naturally, the question of guarantees that these accords will be observed by the two sides for the duration of the agreed-on periods is being raised. At the moment a careful analysis is being made of the two sides' service records in observing previously concluded treaties and the principled approaches of the USSR and the United States to the role of arms control in ensuring military-political stability on our planet. We have asked TASS Observer Vladimir Bogachev to express his thoughts on this quesiton.

[Bogachev] Unfortunately, it must be stated that in the 7 years that the Reagan administration has been in power the number of agreements in force on limiting and reducing armaments has fallen considerably. The USSR has by no means been to blame for this. The present U.S. Administration began its activity in Washington by declaring the 1979 treaty on limiting strategic armaments fundamentally flawed. Later, the U.S. Administration finally refused to observe the provisions of SALT II and called the treaty a dead one. At the same time Washington also renounced the 1972 Salt I temporary agreement.

Fred Ikle, U.S. undersecretary of defense, once stated frankly that the United States should adhere to international treaties only as long as they do not hinder the implementation of the Pentagon's military programs. It turned out that the Pentagon was reflecting the point of view of the whole U.S. Administration. The ambiguous and, in essence, negative approach of the U.S. side to the limitation and reduction of armaments is also shown by its attitude toward the treaties that had been signed on underground tests of nuclear weapons and on peaceful nuclear explosions. Washington refused to ratify these agreements and thus aroused legitimate suspicion with regard to the aims being pursued here. In 7 years the United States has derailed important arms control agreements. It has violated disarmament processes by undermining the foundations of agreements still in force. A clear example of this is the Star Wars program, which has been adopted and which envisages that the United States will violate very important provisions of the 1972 ABM Treaty.

Here the question arises: Will the United States observe the missile agreement which is being prepared? For example, will it honestly eliminate its medium-range missiles; will it cease producing them? It must be said that the draft of the new agreement envisions, for the first time, extremely effective measures for verification [proverka], including on the spot inspections. These verification [proverka] measures exclude the chance of deception on the part of the United States and thus greatly strengthen the regime of observing all the agreement as a whole. Compared to previous agreements, this considerable difference in the accord on medium- and shorter-range missiles gives grounds for optimism.

Events, Activities Reported, Reviewed

Disarmament Message Received

LD061439 Moscow TASS in English 1238 GMT 6 Dec 87

[Text] Moscow December 6 TASS—Mikhail Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, and U.S. President Ronald Reagan have received a joint message of leaders of Argentina, Greece, India, Mexico, Tanzania and Sweden dated December 4, which said:

"On December 7 the whole world passionately wishing the threat of nuclear war to be removed will follow your meeting in Washington with close attention.

"During your summit meetings in Geneva and Reykjavik a foundation was laid. In Geneva you jointly expressed resolve to prevent an arms race in space, to put an end to the arms race on the earth and eventually to eliminate nuclear weapons everywhere. In Reykjavik those plans were shaped into concrete disarmament proposals. We wish you success today when you are beginning to put those proposals into practice.

"The signing of a treaty on the elimination of all the ground-based intermediate-range nuclear forces will become a major first step on the way to nuclear disarmament. The world expects you to move rapidly along this path. We sincerely hope that your summit meeting will bring about an atmosphere permitting quickly to draw up and conclude ever more far-reaching agreements in the sphere of disarmament.

"In these conditions the elimination of the intermediate-range nuclear force will be regarded not as a separate event, but as a divide marking the unconditional termination of the nuclear arms race and the beginning of a confidence-building process in which disarmament plays a vitally important part in ensuring universal peace.

"Soon after your summit meeting we, participants in the initiative of the six countries, will get together in Stockholm for summing up the results of progress achieved at the present stage in the sphere of disarmament and for formulating the next tasks which we regard as first-priority ones.

"We do not take decisions on nuclear disarmament. However, both nuclear and non-nuclear powers bear responsibility for the prevention of a war and the creation of a stable and just world order. On our part, we shall continue to use the right of speech of the non-nuclear part of humanity and voice our opinion of the problems on which everybody's life depends. We are going to continue a dialogue on ways to achieve nuclear disarmament and to confirm the role of all the countries in ensuring the survival of our civilization.

More on 4 Dec News Conference

LD050130 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1800 GMT 4 Dec 87

[From the "Vremya" newscast]

[Text] [Announcer] In Washington news conferences by a Soviet delegation's group of experts are continuing. [Video shows news conference in progress with caption: reportage by S. Alekseyev, D. Serebryakov, A. Gromov, V. Dolina]

[Begin recording] [Unidentified correspondent] At another news conference before the summit meeting, the Soviet experts on economic and social issues—Abel Aganbegyan, Stefan Sitaryan, and Nikolay Shishlin—talked about restructuring [perestroyka] in these important spheres of life in the USSR. It was emphasized that the strategy of restructuring had been defined and that its practical implementation is now unfolding in two main directions: the democratization of Soviet society and the carrying out a radical economic reform.

Replying to the question: Is Soviet restructuring not a mobilization of the latest technology and economy for military aims, Stefan Sitaryan, first deputy chairman of the USSR State Planning Committee, said:

[Sitaryan] It seems to me that this statement has nothing in common with the aim and essence of restructuring. The aim of restructuring is first and foremost to increase the dynamism of the development of our economy, and first of all in the name of achieving its supreme aim, the improvement of the life of our people. The first steps of restructuring, albeit small ones for the time being—not much time has gone by—are indeed evidence of this. It is known that our economy develops according to plans. If one is to draw up the preliminary results of the first 2 years of the development of the economy, which coincide precisely with the restructuring period, then it can be noted quite clearly that the greatest development by comparison with the plan is to be observed in the social sphere. [end recording]

Glasnost Addressed

LD051459 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 2330 GMT 4 Dec 87

[Text] Washington, 5 Dec (TASS)—Special correspondents Aleksandr Belikov, Vitaliy Chukseyev and Gennadiy Shishkin report:

The implementation of restructuring in the USSR is closely linked with two key problems: the democratization of the entire public life and a radical economic reform, Albert Vlasov, head of the USSR press group at the forthcoming Soviet-U.S. summit, stated. He spoke on Friday at a briefing in Washington where over 6,000 Soviet and foreign journalists have been accredited. Together with Vladimir Kudryavtsiy, director of the Institute of the State and the Law of the USSR Academy of Sciences, and Vitaliy Korotich and Yegor Yakovlev, the heads of sociopolitical publications which are popular in the USSR, he explained to correspondents in the essence of changes taking place with are aimed at transforming Soviet society.

Albert Vlasov pointed out that the process of restructuring is unthinkable without the culture of democracy. He explained that this means in effect abandoning the command administrative style of work and empty talk. Democratization which embraces all sections of the population is the aim and the means of revolutionary renewal. It implies an indispensable enhancement of the role of the soviets of people's deputies, a further improvement of the electoral system, and the development of public self-government.

The head of the USSR press group stressed further that the democratization of Soviet society involves an immense range of thought, convictions, and views. Of course, it also involves the strengthening of socialist legality and law and order.

Albert Vlasov called glasnost "the air of restructuring". As an instrument of democracy it is unthinkable without taking a sober, honest look at oneself and the surrounding world. The word "glasnost" has entered all political glossaries. Glasnost contributes to the strengthening of trust and the clearing of blockages of prejudices and destroys the old stereotypes of enmity and hatred.

Answers were given to numerous questions by correspondents which at times were of an unfriendly or decidely anti-Soviet nature. Such an approach was briefly described by Albert Vlasov, who stated:"Sometimes these questions are brought about by a lack of information. They claim that, for instance, every believer is watched by two KGB officers...Such contortions, he continues, could undoubtedly contribute to the growth of anti-U.S. attitudes, however our mass media do not permit this.

In their questions a number of U.S. journalists referred to reports of the U.S. State Department, in which the Soviet Union is accused of "nonfulfillment of the provisions of the Helsinki Act". We understand human rights differently and differ in our approach to various problems, the Soviet representatives stated. Nevertheless, we can look into the mirror provided it has been well made and does not distort. As regards the Helsinki agreements, the USSR is rigorously carrying them out.

A TASS correspondent asked whether the Soviet side intends to repeat the proposal to hold an international conference on human rights in Moscow at the forthcoming talks, bearing in mind that this idea has been received coolly by the U.S. Administration. We have repeatedly confirmed our readiness to organize such a conference in Moscow, Albert Vlasov said. It would be possible at such a forum, held according to all the standards of Helsinki, to discuss the broadest range of issues—political, social, economic and other human rights.

5 Dec News Conference

LD052318 Moscow Television Service in Russian 2120 GMT 5 Dec 87

[Text] [Announcer] On the eve of the Soviet-U.S. summit meeting, the news conferences held by Soviet experts in Washington are getting much attention.

[Begin recording; Vladimir Posner, identified by screen caption] The news conferences being held by the Soviet delegation in Washington on the eve of the summit are drawing the most concentrated attention of the mass media and the public. People with various interests are coming to the conference hall at the National Press Club, some to clarify what is going on today in the Soviet Union for themselves, to find out about glasnost and restructuring; they want to understand. Others come mainly to make a nuisance of themselves. [video shows Natan Sharanskiy] Answers are of no interest to them and they have no desire to understand anything. This situation was confirmed today when answers to questions on the policy of glasnost were given by Vitaliy Korotich, editor-in-chief of *Ogonek* magazine; Academician Kudryatsev, director of the State and Law Institute of the USSR Academy of Sciences; Yegor Yakovlev, editor-in-chief of the *Moskovskiye Novosti* paper; and Albert Ivanovich Vlasov, first deputy head of a department of the CPSU Central Committee, who opened the conference. [Video shows participants, identified by name cards on the long table in front of them]

[Vlasov] Yesterday, my colleagues told you about restructuring. The implementation of restructuring is connected to two key problems, as radical economic reform in the Soviet Union is not possible without the democratization of public life. There are not two problems here; they are one, interlinked. If one link in the problem is removed, the other is destroyed, and this is understandable, since in both cases we are talking about people, the human factor. Democracy appears as the end and the means of restructuring. Glasnost in these two processes—economic reform and the development of democracy—appears as the instrument of democracy, as the air of restructuring.

[Pozner] A great many questions were asked. They asked about informal associations in the USSR, what amendments were proposed to introduce into the criminal code, how the electoral system will be improved. They were pointed and direct questions and they received direct and detailed answers in the spirit of glasnost; that is, of an honest look both at oneself and at others. There were hostile questions too, calculated to put the Soviet participants off. But calm and perfectly clear answers were forthcoming. They did not manage to turn the news conference into a bazaar or to reduce matters to an exchange of fire. Of course, dialogue is progressing with difficulty, prejudices are too profound, ignorance is too great. Anything worthwhile is only gained at the cost of great effort. News conferences like these facilitate the development of the process. Its most vivid indicator is the summit meeting between the leaders of the two countries. But the unchanging truth should not be forgotten—without mutual understanding and respect on the level of ordinary people and without dialogue between them, it is impossible to attain either disarmament or peace. [end recording]

Further on News Conference

LD060907 Moscow TASS in English 0815 GMT 6 Dec 87

[Text] Washington December 6 TASS—By TASS correspondent Oleg Polyakovskiy:

Literature and the arts are two of the vehicles for the restructuring drive (perestroyka) in the USSR, Albert Vlasov, head of the USSR press group at the upcoming Soviet-American summit meeting said. Addressing a briefing for Soviet and foreign newsmen here on Saturday, he stressed that by force of the specific character of their work, men of letters and workers in the arts were prompt in striking against and exposing the negative phenomena involved in the retardation period.

Under the conditions of a broadening of democracy and public openness (glasnost) in the field of literature, and the arts there have been great changes which make the life of Soviet people even wealthier culturally and cleanse the ethical climate in our society. We feel that culture cannot successfully develop in the conditions of isolation and tends to go beyond the national framework. Therefore, we advocate the broadest and diverse ties in the cultural field, cooperation in various fields if it contributes to strengthening understanding among nations, the head of the Soviet press group noted.

Soviet, U.S. Polls Compared

LD041500 Moscow TASS in English 0949 GMT 4 Dec 87

[text] Moscow December 4 TASS—81 per cent of people in the Soviet Union polled during a special survey conducted by the Institute for Sociological Studies under the U.S.S.R. Academy of Sciences and the Gallup institute believe that the "Star Wars" program would heighten the probability of war. It should be noted that 39 per cent of the 1,622 Americans polled in that survey hold the same view, although 40 per cent of them believe that SDI will promote the cause of peace.

The results of the poll show that Soviet people are more concerned than Americans at the threat of war, Yelena Bashkirova, one of the organizers of the survey, told a TASS correspondent. 37 per cent of them think "often and with apprehension" about a possible nuclear war, she said. Only 18 percent of the American respondents accepted the same words for describing their sentiments.

Another version of the reply "although I'm concerned at the thought about the threat of nuclear war, I try to shake it off" was chosen by 44 per cent of the respondents in the U.S.S.R. and 51 per cent in the U.S. 28 per cent of the Americans said they did not "believe that the probability of nuclear war was high enough to warrant concern." Only 12 per cent of the Soviet respondents hold the same view.

The poll made it possible to compare the military potentials of the U.S.S.R. and the United States. About one-half of the respondents (54 per cent in the Soviet Union and 49 in the U.S.) believe that they are roughly equal. At the same time the American and Soviet respondents hold different views on what the correlation of forces between the two powers should be. Although 50 per cent in the U.S. favor military parity, 43 per cent believe that the U.S. should be stronger than the U.S.S.R.

By contrast, only 15 per cent of the Soviet respondents insist on the need for military superiority over the United States.

The survey also demonstrated that Soviet people have more faith in their government's striving for peace. 88 per cent in the Soviet Union and only 41 per cent in the United States are of the opinion that their country will never be the first to use nuclear weapons.

'Antiwar Action' Planned

LD041143 Moscow TASS in English 1121 GMT 4 Dec 87

[Text] Moscow December 4 TASS—An anti-war action, "the file of peace", devoted to the coming Soviet-American summit meeting, will be held in Moscow next Saturday under the motto "Yes to the treaty, and go further". An anti-war meeting will be held in the afternoon in the centre of the city, the Kalininsky Avenue, and its participants will pass an address to Mikhail Gorbachev and Ronald Reagan, journalists were told today at a briefing held at the Soviet Peace Committee. In the address the Muscovites want to express profound satisfaction with the fact that the meeting of the two leaders has become a reality. The public of Moscow welcomes the agreement on elimination of medium- and shorter-range missiles and expresses the hope that the first step will be followed by other concrete actions leading to a nuclear-free world.

The texts of the address will be handed over by the file of people to stretch from the Moscow House of Friendship to the reception offices of the USSR Supreme Soviet and the U.S. Embassy in Moscow.

This peace initiative comes from "below"—from numerous peace committees that were formed in the recent time at enterprises, institutions, scientific centres of the capital. It is a concrete example of "people's diplomacy", it was noted at the briefing. It is noteworthy that a similar action is planned to be held in Washington where "the file of peace" will extend from the White House to the Embassy of the USSR.

'Peace Chain' Links in Moscow

LD051023 Moscow World Service in English 1000 GMT 5 Dec 87

[Text] "Yes to the treaty!" Under this slogan an antiwar action, peace chain, took place in Moscow. Thousands of young Muscovites gathered for a meeting in the center of the Soviet capital and issued an appeal to the Soviet and American leaders. They expressed support for the upcoming meeting between Mikhail Gorbachev and Ronald Reagan, welcomed the agreement on eliminating medium-range and shorter-range missiles, and voiced hope that this step will be followed by other concrete measures on the path toward a denuclearized world. These appeals were passed through the live chain, together with flowers, to the reception room of the Supreme Soviet and to the American Embassy here in Moscow.

A similar action is to be carried out today by the American peace activists, who intend to form a live chain of peace from the White House to the Soviet Embassy in Washington.

Washington Demonstration

LD061642 Moscow TASS in English 1207 GMT 6 Dec 87

[Text] Washington December 6 TASS—By TASS correspondent Igor Borisenko:

The bridge of peace in the form a human chain stretched on Saturday from the White House to the Soviet Embassy in the USA.

This demonstration, held on the eve of the Soviet-U.S. summit meeting, was sponsored by a broadly based coalition of anti-war organisations. "Give peace a chance," the demonstrators chanted.

Several hundred people were needed to form such a human chain but much more people have come, a commentator of one of the local radio stations said not without surprise. People of different age, trades and often of different political views gathered here on this day to express their profound satisfaction with the drafting of a Soviet-U.S. agreement to eliminate medium- and shorter-range missiles and the hope for new steps towards the reduction of nuclear arsenals.

On the same day when the human chain cut through the Lafayette Park, a group of youngsters with flowers came to the Soviet Embassy in the USA. Living in different countries, they came to the American capital at the initiative of the international children's organisation "The Birds of Peace" which gathered 230,000 children's letters on peace. The children were warmly greeted by the staff of the Soviet Embassy.

However, the young "ambassadors of peace" had quite a different reception at the White House where they managed to speak only with...a guard. They were not allowed beyond the fence of the President's residence. *Washington Post* describes the events that followed. The children, it wrote, left flowers they brought outside the sentry box. After some time an officer of the American parks service emerged from the box, gathered the flowers up and threw them into a dustbin. One of the organisers of the visit, who accompanied the children to the gates of the White House, said the children had received "not a very good civics lesson."

Moscow 'Mass Meeting'

LD061615 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1513 GMT 6 Dec 87

[Text] Moscow, 6 Dec (TASS)—Participants at a mass meeting in Moscow today wished success to the forthcoming Soviet-U.S. summit meeting. Hundreds of people crowded into the square opposite the USSR Foreign Ministry bearing placards: "We believe in the victory of peace-loving forces," "Nuclear weapons for the scrapheap," "Yes to the treaty, and beyond."

People of various ages and professions spoke one after the other from an improvised podium—a truck with its sides down. "All of us inhabitants of the earth should unite in the name of the great goal, that of preserving human civilization," poet Aleksey Markov declared. "Soviet people and Americans did not shed their blood fighting against the fascists in order to let warmongers again get the upper hand," Labor Veteran Petr Vindyukov said.

One of those taking part in the meeting, young scientist Yuriy Shiyayev, told the TASS correspondent: "Through the nature of my work I often have to talk to representatives of U.S. business and scientific circles. They sincerely want to cooperate with us. But unfortunately, there are forces in the world which are impeding peaceful dialogue, and not only abroad, either."

These words were confirmed by an outburst by a group of agent provocateurs who had mingled with those taking part in the meeting, and who tried to speak about "human rights," shook their fists and hurled abuse. This provocative action was not supported by those taking part in the meeting.

A resolution which they unanimously adopted stresses that the signing of a treaty between the USSR and the United States on eliminating an entire class of nuclear missiles should be the first step on the road to further arms reduction. It will promote the affirmation of the ideas of peace, international security, and cooperation.

Further on 'Demogogues'

LD062028 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1800 GMT 6 Dec 87

[From the "Vremya" newscast]

[Excerpts] [Presenter] A meeting of peace supporters was held in Moscow today near the Ministry of Foreign Affairs building. Igor Fesunenko, deputy chairman of the Moscow committee for the defense of peace, reports:

[Fesunenko] We gathered at Smolenskaya Square to wish Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev success in his talks with President Reagan. [passage omitted] We believe the gradual liquidation of nuclear weapons has to be the main concern, the most important topic in the talks between the U.S. President and the general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee. It would seem that no one could argue with this.

Alas, there are such people. A small group of demagogues, calling themselves fighters for human rights, attempted to hinder the normal proceedings of the meeting: Excited and loud voices shouted slogans and provoked turmoil. I want only one thing, to emigrate, one of them shouted. Let my people go, another appealed. Notice: my people—my, not ours or yours. They have drawn the line themselves; they have separated themselves from us.

A human rights defender who did not give his name did it this way: He formulated his life credo briefly and categorically. [video shows outdoor gathering, group of protestors, one of whom shouts: "I do not want to live here with you, you understand, I do not want to, I do not love anybody."] I do not want to live here with you, let me go to Israel, to Mother, complained another demagogue, looking around for the cameras of the Western correspondents, of whom, by the way, there were quite a few, and who for some reason were not taking pictures of a heroine mother, a war veteran, workers, youths, poets, and scientists addressing the meeting. It could be seen clearly from the platform that they carefully directed their cameras and microphones at each word of those who want to go to Israel, to Mother, who brought antiwar posters only as camouflage. They were filming only those who want the leaders of the two great countries at the meeting in Washington to engage in the arrangement of their private fates, in the decisions of the problems of their lives, and to forget the main topic, the main concern, and the main pain of all the people in the world—the saving of the world from nuclear suicide. But this, the saving of the world, is expected from the talks of Comrade Gorbachev and President Reagan, for this hope the Soviet and American people and, together with them, all mankind, are striving.

Events Reviewed, Examined

PM041209 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 4 Dec 87 Second Edition p 3

[Special correspondent V. Kuzar dispatch under the rubric "Washington on the Line": "Awaiting the Visit"]

[Text] Washington, 3 Dec—The U.S. capital expectantly awaits the official visit of M.S. Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, to the United States. The topic of the Soviet-U.S. summit talks and the signing there of the agreement to eliminate medium- and shorter-range missiles has literally filled the mass media. Politicians, journalists, and leading specialists on disarmament issues are appearing on television and radio and in the press, and the results of public opinion polls devoted to problems of Soviet-U.S. relations are being published. This flow of information will obviously increase still further over the next few days. Approximately 6,000 journalists from various countries have already been accredited at the world journalism center—the Marriott Hotel, situated at the intersection of 14th Street and Pennsylvania Avenue, near the White House.

The NBC TV interview with M.S. Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, is currently in the sphere of Americans' attention. Many commentators single out the Soviet leader's thought that the USSR and the United States must combine their might—both economic and intellectual—in order to jointly resolve the most important problems common to mankind. No one has been left indifferent by M.S. Gorbachev's words that we must both show more respect for each other and try to better understand the history of our states.

However, the most vigorous comments in the United States today relate to that part of the interview dealing with SDI and the need to observe the ABM Treaty. The well reasoned, consistent, and constructive nature of the Soviet stance on this very important issue is noted. In particular, many newspapers point to the fact that the Soviet Union considers SDI an attempt by certain U.S. circles to forge ahead through the militarization of space and achieve military superiority—which will, in practice, mean the destabilization of the situation with unpredictable consequences. Nor has the USSR's firm conviction that SDI should not be created [sozdavat] or deployed gone unnoticed here. However, if the Americans still do not heed this opinion, an effective response will be found, and it will be 10 times or 100 times cheaper. Such arguments always carry a lot of weight with Americans and produce an impression on them.

The commentaries on the Soviet leader's NBC interview also include ones which are literally steeped in the poison of anti-Sovietism and blaze with malicious slander against our country. Their authors are prepared to accuse even commentator T. Brokaw of not being tough enough and being "unable to counter Mr Gorbachev." All these and similar statements come from representatives of those U.S. circles which oppose an improvement in Soviet-U.S. relations and the conclusion of any arms control treaties. These forces are becoming increasingly consolidated as the meeting between the two countries' leaders approaches, seeking to create a negative atmosphere around it.

This aim is served, in particular, by an article on an alleged Soviet violation of the ABM Treaty carried in *The Washington Post*. A resolute rebuff was dealt to these slanderous fabrications at a news conference of Soviet experts held in Washington. Colonel General N. Chervov said that the U.S. side has already been provided with full information on the so-called "transfer of two radars to western regions of the USSR." In this instance it is a question just of two trucks from which equipment was removed and which were handed over to the national economy. It was even proposed that U.S. specialists inspect the trucks and see for themselves that that was precisely the case. However, instead of that, *The Washington Post* carried a manifestly provocative article.

The same *Washington Post* also recently published a dirty article—there is no other word for it—entitled "The Briefings War." It claims that the Soviets are preparing for a propaganda circus. Even in the opinion of many Americans, particularly J. Pope, manager of the Washington foreign press center, the article is very unfortunate and its publication is to be regretted.

The anti-Soviet chorus of conservatives is also being considerably strengthened by the activation of various Zionist organizations. The intention of Zionists to hold a provocative gathering on the eve of M.S. Gorbachev's official visit has been announced in Washington. It is planned for Sunday, 6 December. Its organizers reckon that approximately 50,000 people will participate in the gathering.

These and other anti-Soviet actions attest that a coordinated campaign is being mounted in the United States with the aim of preventing a relaxation of international tension and undermining the Soviet Union's positions and prestige. Only its organizers will hardly succeed at anything.

'Irritating' Factors Noted

LD051606 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1132 GMT 5 Dec 87

[From the "Novosti" newscast; video report by special correspondent Leonid Zolotarevskiy]

[Text] This is the newsroom of the CBS television company, one of the three vast television networks whose programs are seen throughout the United States. What are you planning to show this evening in your bulletins, I ask Senior Output Editor (Joseph Peironin). A large block of material will be shown, he replies, material devoted to the forthcoming visit, Gorbachev's activities, restructuring in the Soviet Union, and his schedule in the United States.

Of course, as always, even the most serious topics and discussions are systematically interrupted by commercials. Recently, many Americans have told me that, in this context, the constant stream of commercials is, well, inappropriate.

It is not only the commercials, though, that are irritating. The theme of the forthcoming meeting is used by the most zealous anti-Soviet agitators as a peg on which to hang pictures which have only one aim—to poison the atmosphere and to spoil the moral climate, to the extent possible. For this purpose, invitations to take part in programs are issued to all kinds of renegades, former Soviet citizens, [video shows film of man identified by English language screen caption as "Ardady Shevenko, Soviet defector"] and former politicans well-known for their conservative views. [video shows former National Security Adviser Zbignew Brzezinski at meeting] The armaments theme is dispensed with relish, and publicity is given to the U.S. Armed Forces.

Nevertheless, the dominant theme of television programs is the importance of the forthcoming meeting and the great hopes that here, too, in the United States, unite broad strata of the public and ordinary American citizens.

'Zionists' Hold Demonstration

LD062232 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 2125 GMT 6 Dec 87

[Text] Washington, 6 December, (TASS)—On the eve of the summit, there are forces in the United States that speak openly against relaxation of international tension and the improvement of the Soviet-U.S. relations. In an attempt to poison the atmosphere of the forthcoming talks U.S. Zionist organizations held an anti-Soviet demonstration in Washington, bringing from all parts of the country all those who they managed to persuade to take part in the provocative assembly.

Originally, they intended to bring in about 400,000 demonstrators. That many willing participants could not be found, despite the fact that the trip to Washington for the march from the White House to the U.S. Congress and to the meeting on Capitol Hill was organized by Zionist circles and was practically free of charge. A special group from Israel arrived to lead the provocative event.

The orgy's participants in the U.S. capital demanded "Freedom for Soviet Jews," and accused the Soviet Union of suppressing human rights and unbridled anti-Semitism, without producing any proof of discrimination against persons of Jewish nationality. In voicing these monstrously unfair accusations, the organizers of the anti-Soviet demonstration not only grossly distorted reality but also preferred to forget that it was precisely the Soviet soldier who in World War II prevented the execution of the "final solution of the Jewish question" conceived by Hitler, and who did not allow the destruction of the Jewish population in the territories occupied by Germany after the backbone of the Nazi reich had been broken.

In accusing the USSR of human rights violations, the participants in the demonstration in Washington also preferred not to recall how the Zionist state, Israel, has trampled on the rights of the Arab people of Palestine, helped the bloody Somoza regime in Nicaragua to the end, and helps the apartheid regime in the RSA.

Those taking part in the Zionist meeting in Washington asserted that the Soviet authorities are refusing nearly 400,000 Soviet citizens of Jewish nationality permission to go abroad. But as Gennadiy Gerasimov, the official representative of the USSR Ministry of Foreign Affairs, said Sunday in an interview on ABC television, only a few thousand people have requested permission to leave. "These requests are examined, and examined positively," the Soviet representative stressed. Refusal of permission to leave happens in "very rare cases, usually connected with considerations of state security," Gerasimov noted.

Ordinary Americans realize perfectly well the sanctimoniousness and hypocrisy of the organizers of the action. Looking at the "demonstrators" walking toward Congress with their placards "defending" the rights of Soviet Jews, a homeless inhabitant of Washington said bitterly: "For some reason no one remembers our rights."

Yes, and the rights of Soviet Jews clearly are of little concern to the organizers of the anti-Soviet march, who are quite well aware that all thorny questions can be solved, and are solved, around the negotiations table.

The aim of the action carried out Sunday is clearly to try to discredit the Soviet Union and its government in the eyes of the Americans, to try to halt those positive advances in U.S. public opinion toward the USSR, which are taking place now, and which, it is expected, will increase during the visit here by the general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee. In this connection it is not surprising that the Zionist gathering got the White House's blessing. The U.S. President made a special statement in support of the demonstration, saying that he "applauds the efforts" of those taking part. Vice President George Bush took part in the meeting in Capital Hill in person, making an anti-Soviet statement.

Andrianov: 'Nonexistent Issue'

LD052110 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1900 GMT 5 Dec 87

[Boris Andrianov commentary]

[Text] It is reported from Washington that a group of U.S. Zionist organizations is preparing to mount a provocative rally. It is to be held on the eve of the visit to the United States by Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee. The organizers of this venture claim that the planned rally will be held in defense of Soviet Jews. A commentary on the latest news. At the microphone is Boris Andrianov:

[Andrianov] It can hardly be considered mere coincidence that just before each meeting of the Soviet and U.S. leaders there is a recurring outburst of anti-Sovietism in the United States. This was the case before Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev and Ronald Reagan met in Geneva, and it was the same before the start of their talks in Reykjavik. Now, again on the eve of the latest Soviet-U.S. summit meeting, we have another upsurge of anti-Sovietism across the ocean.

It is impossible not to notice that it has been artificially provoked by the ultra-rightwing quarters. Sewing threadbare conjectures regarding the human rights situation in the USSR, they stir up Zionist trouble over the nonexistent Jewish issue in our country. It has, put simply, been fabricated by the bosses of international Zionism so that they might have an excuse for political blackmail, with the aim of hindering an improvement in relations between the Soviet Union and the United States.

In trying to denigrate the Soviet system with their slanderous inventions, such enemies of our country plunge headfirst into dissipation. The result nearly always reveals their absurdity. Here is just one example: A story in the Western press claimed that 400,000 citizens of Jewish nationality wanted to leave the Soviet Union, but were not allowed to do so. Where did this sizeable, not to say round, figure come from? Exactly 400,000, no more and no less. It turns out the riddle is not too difficult: It has now come to light that various organizations and private individuals in Israel have sent Jewish people in our country 400,000 appeals to leave the Soviet Union. It is solely on this basis that this figure has been put into propaganda circulating in the West, a figure that has, as the saying goes, been plucked from nowhere. The figure had to be quite impressive in order to create the impression that Jews are being oppressed in the Soviet Union, since they want to leave the place in such droves.

Incidentally, it is not the destiny of Soviet Jews that interests the Zionists. For them, the most important thing is the clamor surrounding the so-called rightlessness of citizens of Jewish nationality in our country. Confirmation of this is supplied by the instructions sent out by the Zionists. One of them states categorically: The main thing is to raise a hubbub on whatever excuse. The bigger the better. Do whatever you can to encourage applications to emigrate, and advise people to avoid receiving permission to leave for as long as possible. Should anyone be refused a visa, broadcast the fact that the refusal is illegal and inhumane, since the person who want to leave is ill, or is living in destitution, and only wants to die in Israel.

Judging by everything, it is in roughly this provocative and inflammatory spirit that the Zionist rally in the United States is to be held on the eve of the Soviet-U.S. summit meeting.

Church Delegation to U.S.

LD041839 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1408 GMT 4 Dec

[Text] Moscow, 4 December, (TASS)—Metropolitan Filaret of Minsk and Belorussia, a permanent member of the synod of the Russian Orthodox Church, is leading a group of Christian churchmen who are setting off today for the United States. At the invitation of the National Council of Churches of Christ in the United States, they will take part in a joint prayer session for the success of the meeting between Mikhail Gorbachev and Ronald Reagan, which starts 7 December.

In a conversation with a TASS correspondent just before his departure from Moscow, Metropolitan Filaret announced that representatives of the Russian Orthodox Church, the Georgian Orthodox, and the Armenian Apolistic Churches, and the Lutheran Churches of Latvia and Estonia were taking part in the journey.

"I, my companions-in-arms in the field of peacemaking, the parishioners of our numerous churches, and other Soviet people, we ardently welcome the meeting between the leaders of the two great powers," said the religious figure.

The Metropolitan noted that the questions to be discussed at the forthcoming meeting are of immense importance to everyone. "People are longing for their aspirations and hopes to be realized, and for an agreement to be signed that totally eliminates medium- and shorter-range missiles, as a result of the talks between both countries' leaders. We also nourish the hope for further progress in the nuclear arms reduction field, and for the rapid destruction of all nuclear weapons."

"On Sunday, 6 December, in Moscow's Patriarchical Ephiphany Cathedral and in other places of worship of the Russian Orthodox Church, Christians will pray at special services for the nations of the world to be free from the threat of the end of the sacred gift of life, and for the reckless squandering of economic and intellectual resources on the creation and production of weapons of death to come to an end. Man must direct his efforts toward upholding the eternal spiritual principles of brotherhood, justice, and peace on earth. With such thoughts and feelings, we are setting off for the United States, in anticipation of a warm welcome from our brothers and sisters in Christ," said Metropolitan Filaret.

Patriarch Pimen Urges Prayer

LD061556 Moscow Tass International Service in Russian 1354 GMT 6 Dec 87

[Text] Moscow, 6 Dec (TASS)—The Sunday service in the Moscow Patriarchal Cathedral of the Epiphany ended with solemn prayer in connection with the forthcoming Soviet-U.S. summit meeting.

The address by Patriarch Pimen of Moscow and All Russia to the congregation called the forthcoming signing of an agreement to scrap two classes of nuclear missiles by the leaders of the two powers "a truly historic event opening the way to liberating the whole earth from nuclear weapons and to reaching a stable peace and security for all peoples."

On the days of the lofty meeting, recalled Patriarch Pimen, representaitve of the Christian churches of the USSR and the United States are to hold a joint session of continuous prayer in Washington's Episcopalian cathedral, for favorable results at the talks.

Addressing U.S. Christians, the head of the Russian Orthodox Church said: "You and we must deepen our prayers and multiply our labors in order that mankind might welcome the third millenium since the coming into the world of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ, in a world free of nuclear weapons and with the heavens peaceful."

Northeast Asia

Gorbachev Congratulates Japanese CP Head

LD041804 Moscow TASS in English 1700 GMT 4 Dec 87

[Text] Moscow December 4 TASS—General Secretary of the CPSU Central Committee Mikhail Gorbachev has cordially congratulated Kenji Miyamoto on his reelection to the post of chairman of the Communist Party of Japan's Central Committee.

Gorbachev wished him and the Japanese Communists success in the struggle for a nuclear-free world, for democracy and social progress.

Dmitriyev on Japanese Reaction to INF Treaty

OW051224 Moscow in Japanese to Japan 1000 GMT 2 Dec 87

[Dmitriyev commentary]

[Text] Japanese newspapers have recently carried various opinions on the Soviet-U.S. treaty abolishing all medium-range missiles, a treaty that is to be signed during General Secretary Gorbachev's visit to the United States. In this connection, Moscow Radio Commentator Dmitriyev writes as follows:

As recently as a few months ago, the Japanese Government regarded the medium-range missiles in the Asian part of the Soviet Union as a difficult issue. The Soviet Union, however, has agreed to dismantle the medium-range missiles in this area through overall agreements with the United States in consideration of the wishes of the people in Asian countries. This Soviet decision has aroused a forward-looking response from the Japanese leadership. Judging from their various remarks, Japanese leaders link the abolition of medium-range missiles to a chance for improving Japan-USSR relations.

Against this backdrop, a statement was issued by a Japanese Foreign Ministry spokesman. The statement, which was carried in *Asahi Shimbun*, represents a contrasting response. The statement said the Japanese Foreign Ministry cannot unconditionally welcome the Soviet-U.S. treaty, noting that the medium-range missiles account for only a small part of the nuclear weapons held by the Soviet Union and the United States.

Needless to say, it would be most desirable if we could reach an agreement on scrapping all types of nuclear weapons all at once. To do this, however, there are many problems, and these problems can be resolved only step-by-step. This position is reflected in the Soviet-proposed plan for complete nuclear disarmament by the year 2000. By abolishing the medium-range missiles, or any other class of nuclear weapons, we will have resolved one issue, and this will enable us to take on another issue. For example, a sharp reduction in strategic attack weapons under conditions that the ABM Treaty—that is, the Antiballistic Missile Treaty—will be strictly observed will be taken up as a central issue in the negotiations during General Secretary Gorbachev's visit to the United States.

The medium-range missiles account for approximately 4% of the Soviet nuclear force, but their abolition is significant not only because it sets a precedent, but because the flight time of these missiles is only 8 to 10 minutes, or about one-third that of an intercontinental ballistic missile (ICBM). In other words, if the medium-range missiles are fired by mistake, the time we have to make a decision to prevent a global nuclear war will be only one-third as long as when an ICBM is misfired. For this reason, medium-range missiles raise the element of instability in military confrontation, and therefore their abolition enhances world security.

When we consider this clear fact, it is difficult for us to understand the Japanese Foreign Ministry spokesman's remarks that it is feared that the abolition of medium-range missiles will bring about military instability. This stance is a remnant of the past approach on military issues. It is hard to explain the stance otherwise. For instance, a high-ranking Japanese official once proposed that the United States deploy the medium-range missiles in Alaska and named the Soviet Far Eastern cities as their target. This traditional way of thinking, which views weapons as means of security, has stimulated nuclear armament and increased the nuclear threat to the present level. A Soviet-U.S. treaty on the abolition of medium-range missiles deserves our unconditional support simply from the standpoint of freeing us of confrontational psychology.

Under the present situation, any move to attach conditions to this treaty, regardless of its motive, will help those opposing the treaty in the United States. Conservative politicians and congressmen are attempting to block the ratification of the treaty. Former Deputy Secretary of Defense Perle, one of the leaders in this opposition campaign, once said that nuclear disarmament is a dangerous folly. The deputy secretary, in a number of his articles, mentioned the insecurity involved in the abolition of medium-range missiles, just as the Japanese Foreign Ministry spokesman did. The governments of West European countries are aware that any acts of hesitation could be used by hardliners for propaganda purposes, and for this reason they are all voicing support for the treaty.

Near East & South Asia

Gromyko Receives Iran's Envoy Hayrani-Nobari

Suggests Iran Stop War

PM070909 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 5 Dec 87 Second Edition p 5

[TASS Report under the headline "Meeting on the Kremlin"]

[Text] The senseless, bloody Iran-Iraq war is now into its eighth year. According to foreign information, the loss of life on both sides over 7 years amounts to over 1.2

million people, while the damage to the economy of the two countries taken together surpasses 500 billion dollars. Pursuing a consistent peaceful course, the Soviet Union has declared more than once at international forums and during bilateral meetings for the need to immediately end this devastative and terrible bloodbath for both Iran and Iraq.

Andrey Gromyko spoke about this again during a 4 December conversation with Iran's ambassador to the USSR Naser Hayrani-Nobari. The ambassador was received in the Kremlin at his request. He made a flight to Tehran and was back in Moscow yesterday evening by a regular flight of Aeroflot, which resumed Soviet airline flights to and from Iran beginning October 15, 1987,under a bilateral arrangement.

Naser Hayrani-Nobari handed over a message of the leadership of the Islamic Republic of Iran to the leadership of the Soviet Union.

After the presentation of the message, the ambassador said that the spirit of the document is that cooperation with the Soviet Union should be widened. This was precisely the conclusion of the leadership of the Islamic Republic of Iran. It thanks the Soviet Union for a firm stand in the UN Security Council on the question of the attitude toward Iran, and expresses the hope that it will be the same in the future. The ambassador said that his side is prepared to cooperate closely with the Soviet Union so that all naval ships of the countries other than the littoral states, now sailing in the Persian Gulf, and creating an explosive situation there, be withdrawn.

Andrey Gromyko: Which NATO countries have relations with you whose value you appreciate now?

Naser Hayrani-Nobari: At present Iran does not have such good relations that would deserve being mentioned with any NATO country. Meanwhile, we highly appreciate our ties with the Soviet Union and would like to develop them along two lines: By cooperating in various United Nations bodies and on a bilateral basis. Good relations meet the interests of our two countries.

The Soviet side went along with the idea that it is both Iran and the Soviet Union that need good relations. It is a convincing and well-substantiated idea but, if one assesses the past, the Iranian side has not always proceeded from this view. The lessons for the future should be drawn now. We have a common border. The very geographic position of our countries requires that we should have good relations, both now and in the future.

The main thing, Andrey Gromyko said passing on to the theme of the Iran-Iraq war, is that blood is being spilt profusely, but the Soviet leadership holds that neither Iran nor Iraq have blood to spare.

You as an ambassador and the Iranian leadership made a great number of statements about the wish to end the war. But the war goes on. Iran is practically not carrying matters toward ending the war. Therefore the main question remains unresolved. We say this to the Iranian leadership as neighbors, as a country which wishes to have friendly relations with Iran. It is not every state that can say such words to you now.

An end to the war is not just a ceasefire when the sides do not know what the day-to-come bears for them. If Iran really stopped the war and embarked on a political settlement of disputes with Iraq nobody would assess this step as a defeat for Iran. Quite the contrary; we are sure this action would be assessed in the world in such a way that Iran, having stood up for itself, still arrived at a truly correct conclusion. It is an axiom that an end to the war and consent to the quest of a political settlement to the differences with Iraq is a reasonable decision. Iran would gain much more than it would lose.

So then, what losses can there be in this case? It is precisely the continuation of war that would lead to the creation of an ever more complex situation for Iran.

Any person would probably agree that the war cannot go on indefinitely, and that the later Iran arrives at the conclusion that it should be ended, the less favourable this will be for Iran. This conclusion stems precisely from a realistic assessment of the situation.

What is more, the continuation of the war would mean a still greater involvement in the events of the Persian Gulf of those who should not be involved in these events, who came from regions lying many thousands of kilometers away.

Setting out the Soviet Union's principled stand regarding an early end of the war, Andrey Gromyko emphasized the importance of an undelayed implementation of the U.N. Security Council's resolution 598, which is a good political basis for an equitable settlement of the Iran-Iraq conflict. If the resolution is not implemented, the question of further steps toward ensuring the implementation of the decisions adopted by the Security Council might be put on the order of the day. This is said in the decision itself.

The attention of the Iranian ambassador was drawn to the importance of the upcoming Soviet-American summit meeting during the visit of the general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee Mikhail Gorbachev to Washington. The signing of the agreement on the elimination of middle- and shorter-range missiles during that meeting would be an initial important and practical step on the road to nuclear disarmament. Questions related to regional conflicts, including the long-drawn-out Iran-Iraq war, as well as the explosive situation in the Persian Gulf closely connected with that war will also be discussed at that meeting.

Both sides expressed profound concern over a high level of tension in the Persian Gulf zone. They noted the insistent need to withdraw from the Gulf naval forces of states other than countres of the region, as it was recently proposed by the Soviet Union. The situation is largely complicated by the build-up of the naval presence of the United States and its allies in the Persian Gulf and on the approaches to it under the pretext of ensuring the safety of shipping.

The Soviet side emphasized that if the presence of forces is needed to ensure free shipping in the Persian Gulf, such forces could be staying there under the United Nations flag.

Andrey Gromyko noted that there exists the basis for the further development of bilateral cooperation between the USSR and Iran. We have many agreements, including agreements on air services and maritime ties. Soviet specialists work in Iran helping it implement various economic projects. The Soviet Union is prepared to continue advancing further in the development of a broad spectrum of ties with Iran.

Naser Hayrani-Nobari emphasized that the Iranian side is in favor of this and attaches special importance to political contacts with the Soviet Union at the highest level possible.

In conclusion the president of the Presidium of the USSR Supreme Soviet said that the message of the Iranian leadership will be closely studied by the Soviet leadership.

The conversation passed in a businesslike and frank [otkrovennyy] atmosphere.

First USSR Deputy Foreign Minister Yuliy Vorontsov and member of staff of the Iranian Embassy in the USSR Majid Qahremani took part in the conversation.

Expanding Relations Stressed

LD051121 Tehran Domestic Service in Persian 1030 GMT 5 Dec 87

[Text] Mr Hayrani-Nobari, the ambassador of the Islamic Republic of Iran in Moscow, yesterday met and conferred with Soviet President Andrey Gromyko. At this meeting, which was also attended by Soviet First Deputy Foreign Minister, Yuliy Vorontsov, the ambassador of the Islamic Republic of Iran read a message from Iranian officials to the leaders of the USSR. Then the two sides, in the course of detailed talks, voiced their pleasure at the daily growth in relations between the two neighboring countries. The ambassador of the Islamic Republic of Iran emphasized: The Islamic Republic of Iran expands and strengthens its relations with other countries on the basis of fraternity and mutual respect to the level desired by them. Describing the aggressions of the Iraqi regime against the principled stances of the Islamic Republic of Iran, Mr Hayrani-Nobari stressed the necessity for naming and punishing the aggressor as a preliminary step toward a just end to the war.

Andrey Gromyko then condemned the aggressive U.S. policy in the Persian Gulf and expressed his deep anxiety at the daily increasing tension in that region, stressing: In order to decrease tension in the Persian Gulf it is vital that the naval forces of foreign forces withdraw from that region. The president of the Soviet Union said: Wherever Iran's interests are at stake, the United States is bent on taking military and political action against it. The ambassador of the Islamic Republic of Iran, in reply to the question put to him by President Gromyko concerning the state of relations between the Islamic Republic of Iran and Western countries, said: The Islamic Republic of Iran has good traditional relations with most countries of Western Europe who follow an independent policy, and it will expand and strengthen these relations on the basis of mutual interests.

Danish Tanker Attacked in Gulf, One Killed

LD061016 Moscow TASS in English 0950 GMT 6 Dec 87

[Text] Paris December 6 TASS—A tanker flying the Danish flag was attacked in the Persian Gulf in the morning today, the *France Presse Agency* said. The tanker was hit with rocket propelled grenades from a naval speedboat. One crew member was killed and another critically injured. The incident took place off the coast of Dubayy principality, which is part of the United Arab Emirates.

West Europe

Gorbachev Departs for London, Washington Summit

Sent Off at Vnukovo Airport

LD070836 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 0800 GMT 7 Dec 87

[Text] Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, left Moscow today for an official visit to the United States. On the way to Washington, he will make a short stopover in Great Britain at the invitation of the British prime minister, and he will have a working meeting with Mrs Thatcher.

Among the officials accompanying the general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee are Eduard Amrosiyevich Shevardnadze, member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and USSR Foreign Minister; Yakovlev, member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and secretary of the CPSU Central Committee; Dobrynin, secretary of the CPSU Central Committee; Kamentsev, deputy chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers; Akhromeyev, USSR first deputy defense minister and marshal of the Soviet Union; Chernyayev, aide to the general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee; and Dubinin, USSR ambassador to the United States.

Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev was seen off at Vnukovo Airport by members of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo Vorotnikov, Gromyko, Zaykov, Ligachev, Ryzhkov, Slyunkov, Solomentsev, Chebrikov; candidate members of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo Demichev, Dolgikh, Talyzin, Yazov; secretaries of the CPSU Central Committee Biryukova, Lukyanov, Medvedev, Razumovskiy; Kapitonov, chairman of the CPSU Central Auditing Commission; and other comrades.

Among those who saw him off was Joyce, charge d'affaires ad interim of the United States in the USSR, and Marshall, charge d'affaires of Great Britain in the USSR.

Makes Stopover in Britain

LD071150 Moscow TASS in English 1132 GMT 7 Dec 87

[Text] Brize Norton (Oxfordshire) December 7 TASS—Mikhail Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, made a brief stopover in Britain on December 7 at the invitation of British Prime Minister Margaret Thatcher on his way to Washington for a Soviet-U.S. summit meeting.

At Brize Norton airfield, he was met by British Prime Minister Margaret Thatcher, by Geoffrey Howe, secretary of state for foreign and commonwealth affairs, and by Leonid Zamyatin, the ambassador of the USSR to the United Kingdom.

At the ramp of the plane Margaret Thatcher welcomed Mikhail Gorbachev, Raisa Gorbacheva, and the Soviet delegation members—Eduard Shevardnadze, Aleksandr Yakovlev, Anatoliy Dobrynin, Vladimir Kamentsev, and Marshal Sergey Akhromeyev.

The state flags of the Soviet Union and the United Kingdom were hoisted at the airfield, and a guard of honor of the Royal Air Force was lined up. The national anthem of the Soviet Union was played.

The welcoming ceremony was followed by talks between Mikhail Gorbachev and Margaret Thatcher.

Raisa Gorbacheva, the wife of the general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, visited a school near Brize Norton airfield.

She was welcomed by the principal, the teaching staff, and pupils. They showed her the classrooms and acquainted her with the life of the school.

During the tour of the school, Raisa Gorbacheva was accompanied by Kenneth Baker, British secretary of state for education and science.

Moscow Commentaries on Gorbachev-Thatcher Meeting

Station Commentary

LD052350 Moscow in English to Great Britain and Ireland 2000 GMT 5 Dec 87

[Station commentary]

[Text] The fact that Mikhail Gorbachev's visit to the United States will be preceded by this meeting with Mrs. Thatcher reflects the great importance Moscow attaches to its relationship with Britain and to that country's role in reducing the nuclear threat. When announcing in Parliament about the Soviet leader's arrival, Margaret Thatcher said she hoped they would have good talks, discussing in detail measures on nuclear disarmament to be taken after a treaty on medium- and shorter-range missiles was signed.

A few days ago the Soviet foreign minister, Eduard Shevardnadze, said this treaty was international in nature since nuclear missiles would be removed from nine countries. Britain, for one, will dismantle cruise missiles at the bases in Greenham Common and Molesworth. The British antiwar campaigners have long been seeking this move. The one-half reduction in Soviet and American nuclear potentials, due to be discussed at the Washington summit, will not directly affect either Britain or France. However, these two countries are known to be favoring the preservation and build-up of their national nuclear forces. Mrs Thatcher said as much to Mikhail Gorbachev during her visit to Moscow last March. The Soviet leader said at the time that European security must be based on a new political thinking that will take into account the balance of all countries' interests, rather than on a policy of nuclear threats. He reaffirmed this country's readiness to start all-around and serious negotiations on cuts in conventional weapons and armed forces of the two military blocs. He pointed to the fact that the Soviet proposals reflected the concerns of Britain and other West European countries, including those about conventional and chemical weapons.

The Soviet Union is ready to promote comprehensive relations with Britain in the interests of peace and security in Europe and the world over and this, obviously, will be the major topic for discussion at Mikhail Gorbachev's meeting with Margaret Thatcher.

Yevgeniy Ivanov Commentary

LD062134 Moscow in English to Great Britain and Ireland 2000 GMT 6 Dec 87

[Yevgeniy Ivanov commentary]

[Text] Tomorrow's talks between Mikhail Gorbachev and Mrs Margaret Thatcher will probably be the briefest summit meeting ever. This fact, however, in no way diminishes the attention to this event. This is what Yevgeniy Ivanov writes.

As far as we can see, the British Government finds the meeting essential. We also see the Monday exchange of opinions as a follow up to the productive Soviet-British dialogue of the past 3 years, starting with Mikhail Gorbachev's visit to Britain in 1984 through Mrs Thatcher's visit to the Soviet Union last spring, and on to this coming instance of bilateral contacts.

It is fair to say then that the route to Washington lies through London, and not only in a geographical sense, for some commentaries are now stressing the special relationship between Moscow and London, without forgetting, of course, Britain's continued special relations with her American cousins.

But this is a special moment and that special attention is needed to the key issue, that of survival. We must prevent a collective suicide, as Mikhail Gorbachev describes nuclear war in his book recently published by Collins. This is what rivets public attention to this month's events.

The Soviet-American agreement on medium- and shorter-ranger missiles, to be signed in Washington on Tuesday, is more than a mere 3% reduction in the nuclear arsenals of the two great powers. The stakes are higher. Hopefully we will be able to enter the new millenium with greater confidence in the durability of a fragile world where all things are interrelated, and it will be durable if it is made nuclear-free.

The agreements which will be signed in Washington stems from a responsible attitude of both countries. Optimism is also inspired by the unanimous approval given to the agreement by West European governments, that includes the British prime minister and the French president, who said that only people with perverted minds would not welcome scrapping nuclear missiles trained in France.

When Soviet people rejoice in the agreement, they also think of the Pershings and cruise missiles deployed in Britain. However the Soviet leader will make a stopover on his way to American in a country whose government is not yet ready to accept the idea of a nuclear-free Europe. London still sees nuclear arms as a guarantee of security. The Conservative cabinet intends to modernize Britain's nuclear forces, though during the Second World War Churchill called the Soviet Union "our gallant ally." The decades since then have piled up obstacles of mistrust, but we must take a first step toward clearing up the mess.

Did anyone believe when American nuclear arms were deployed in Britain after the Second World War that the day would come for them to be scrapped? Now the day has come, and Soviet-British contacts are inseparable from those initial steps dictated by reason.

Howe Interviewed on Summit, Soviet Ties

PM071041 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 7 Dec 87 Second Edition p 6

[Special correspondent A. Lyutyy interview with G. Howe, British secretary of state for foreign and commonwealth affairs, under heading "Building Confidence"; first paragraph is editorial introduction]

[Text] London, 6 Dec—It has been announced here that M.S. Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, will make a brief stop in the British Isles on his way to Washington. Geoffrey Howe, British secretary of state for foreign and commonwealth affairs, gave an interview to our *Pravda* special correspondent.

[Lyutyy] Secretary of state, how important is the forthcoming summit meeting in Washington, in your opinion? What results would you like to see?

[Howe] The most important aspect is the signing of the treaty on medium-range and short-range missiles. This aim has been the main item on the arms control agenda for many years. The governments of all 16 NATO countries are unanimous that this aim must be attained. At the same time, we hope that Mr Gorbachev and President Reagan will achieve further success in the next stage of solving arms control issues. I am mainly thinking of strategic weapons. We also expect them to discuss the main problems concerning regional conflicts, particularly the Persian Gulf situation and the continuing presence of Soviet troops in Afghanistan. It goes without saying, they must also discuss human rights.

[Lyutyy] According to the British press, during M.S. Gorbachev's stopover in Britain, he will have a meeting with Prime Minister M. Thatcher. What can you say about this?

[Howe] We are very pleased that Mr Gorbachev has felt it possible to stop over in the British Isles. I had a conversation with Mrs Thatcher yesterday, when she said that she considers it very important to have a detailed discussion with Mr Gorbachev. She does not agree with him on everything, but she has enormous respect for your leader. I believe the prime minister will take the opportunity to analyze progress in solving the issues which they discussed during her recent visit to Moscow.

[Lyutyy] The British press and also the press in other countries is more and more frequently voicing the opinion that Britain could play a special role in developing USSR-U.S. dialogue on arms control problems and in strengthening mutual understanding between them. How do you yourself regard your country's role?

[Howe] Our attitude is that Britain is still a country loyal to NATO and one of the most reliable members of this alliance. At the same time, Britain is one of the leading members of the European Community, a member of the

UN Security Council, and a nuclear power. We therefore have a great many platforms from which we can be a party to the process of multilateral dialogue. Britain does everything possible to advance the cause of peace and the task of improving mutual understanding between East and West. We are convinced that security can be achieved at a lower level of armament. If we succeed in doing this, East-West relations will improve. But our country wants to fulfill the role of a member of a Western alliance dedicated to improving relations rather than just be an intermediary in East-West affairs.

[Lyutyy] Could you formulate Britain's attitude to the ABM Treaty?

[Howe] The attitude of our prime minister and government is, on the whole, the same as was set out by Mrs Thatcher in Moscow during her March visit. We regard the reduction of ICBM's by both great powers as an important aim. We also believe that this can and must be achieved within the framework of the ABM Treaty. We have noted Mr Gorbachev's recent statement that, like the United States, the USSR is also engaged in research concerning an SDI program. This research must be continued. But an element of predictability is essential. Each side must know more about what the other is doing or planning. Only in this way can we build a foundation of trust and eliminate mistrust and suspicion.

[Lyutyy] How would you describe the current state of Soviet-British relations?

[Howe] I think our relations are very good. Again, I repeat that we do not agree with one another on everything. I remember the first Thatcher-Gorbachev meeting in December 1984. Mrs Thatcher said at the time: We do not look at you through rose-colored glasses, and you do not look at us through rose-colored glasses. We like some things more than others. But whatever the case, it is important to develop trust in our relations with one another in order to strengthen both sides' security. I think we have made good progress in this direction.

I am very glad to be able to address myself directly to *Pravda* readers, G. Howe said in conclusion. I believe that the more freely leaders and peoples of different states communicate with one another and the more glasnost there is, the better it will be.

Further on Ligachev Activities in France

Speech Stresses 'Common Cause'

PM070915 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 5 Dec 87 Second Edition p 5

[TASS report: "Friendly Conversation"]

[Text] Paris, 4 Dec—The CPSU delegation headed by Ye.K. Ligachev, member of the Politburo and secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, which visited the House of Franco-Soviet Friendship in Paris today, was warmly and cordially welcomed by the leadership of the France-USSR Association.

During a friendly conversation, M. Guilbert, executive president of the association, and other members of the association's leadership emphasized the great interest in France in processes under way in the USSR and in the signs emerging as a result of these processes, indicating that the image of the Soviet Union is changing for the better in the French people's eyes. The France-USSR Association recalls with gratitude M.S. Gorbachev's meeting with a large group of prominent representatives of the French public in Moscow in September this year within the framework of a campaign launched by the association under the title "Initiative-87." This meeting was an important event in strengthening mutual sympathies and trust between the peoples of our countries.

Ye.K. Ligachev conveyed to the association and its leaders and activists the warmest and most sincere greetings from M.S. Gorbachev and cordial wishes for success in their noble activities for the good of the Soviet and French people. Irrespective of all differences in our views and persuasions, he said, we are fighting for a common cause, for peace and the survival of mankind and against the nuclear danger. This is in keeping with the principles of the new thinking in foreign policy put forward by at the 27th CPSU Congress. The new thinking proceeds from acknowledgement of the fact that we are living in a contradictory but interconnected and integral world. In a few days the Soviet-American agreement on elimination of medium-range and shorter-range missiles will be signed. This is very important because it marks the beginning of real, practical disarmament.

The head of the CPSU delegation supported the idea of holding a reciprocal Soviet "Initiative" in Paris which could be timed to coincide with the bicentennial of the great French Revolution in 1989.

Our country, Ye.K. Ligachev noted, approached the 70th anniversary of Great October inspired by the revolutionary process of restructuring which has encompassed all aspects of society's life and the entire sphere of the CPSU's activities. It is a long and complex process, but millions of Soviet people have already joined it actively and with interest, which makes it possible for us to look to the future with optimism.

The meeting was attended by activists of the France-USSR Association and Ya.P. Ryabov, USSR ambassador to France.

Addresses Ivry Communists

LD052311 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1800 GMT 5 Dec 87

[Correspondent O. Maksimenko report over video on Ligachev's visit; Maksimenko identified by caption; from the "Vremya" newscast]

[Excerpts] [Announcer] The CPSU delegation taking part in the work of the 26th Congress of the French Communist Party [FCP], is continuing its sojourn in

France. [video shows Ligachev and delegation being applauded as they walk up grand stairway; people selling 1988 FCP calendars and copies of *L'Humanite* at entrance to a hall; copies of Gorbachev's book, *Perestroyka* on sale; Ligachev making his way, to applause, and applauding himself, to a platform]

[Maksimenko] One of the oldest communist town halls in France, in the Paris suburb of Ivry, joyfully received the CPSU delegation led by Comrade Ligachev. Together with other foreign guests at the 26th Congress of the FCP, the delegation arrived to take part in an international soiree of friendship and solidary. [passage omitted]

Ivry's Communist mayor gave the floor to Comrade Ligachev. He said, in part:

[Begin Ligachev recording] We greet French Communists and the Communists of your town, who, led by their red mayor Georges Moran, were in the front ranks of the resistance movement, fighting the German occupiers. [applause]

We have every justification for declaring that the FCP is currently showing steadfastness, courage, and persistence. Soviet Communists have always known the FCP as a party of internationalists, and it is still such a party of internationalists. Through the efforts of all the people of the world, the efforts of communists of every country in the world, the efforts of progressive mankind and the Soviet Union and the socialist countries, we have secured conditions whereby in the very near future the world may start nuclear disarmament in practice, not just in words but in deeds. For we are confident that as a result of Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev's visit to Washington, a Soviet-U.S. treaty on elimination of medium- and short-range missiles will be signed.

There is still a long way to go in order really to create a nuclear-free and secure world. We are therefore pleased to learn of the plans which French Communists have to strengthen the antiwar movement and strengthen the struggle to step up the disarmament process. We are in favor not only of tackling nuclear disarmament, but also of destroying chemical weapons and making a sharp cut in armed forces and conventional weapons. [applause]

Take note, when disarmament starts—voices are raised in Europe declaring that a policy of nuclear deterrence should be conducted, that there should be upgrading of arms, that after elimination of the missiles, additional missiles should be introduced, and so forth. We believe this goes against the current of the disarmament process, that this contradicts the voice of the people, against the will of the people.

We wish the French Communists and Communists of Ivry great successes in fulfilling decisions of the 26th Congress of the French Communist Party. [applause] [end recording]

Holds 4 Dec News Conference

LD052054 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1752 GMT 5 Dec

[Text] Paris, 5 Dec (TASS)—At Friday's news conference by the CPSU delegation, Yegor Ligachev and Vadim Zagladin answered numerous questions from journalists.

Question by Denis Poncet, French television Channel 5: You have just said that each party performs the tasks facing it. It seems you have some disagreements with the PCF [French Communist Party]. Are you not sorry that the PCF is not in a hurry to embark on the road of restructuring and glasnost?

Ye.K. Ligachev: The CPSU firmly adheres to the rule: Each party defines its own policy according to its own national aims and concrete, specific peculiarities. This is a very important and fundamental tenet. As far as the French Communist Party is concerned, we sympathize with its activity and actevely support its struggle for social progress, peace, and international security. We drew attention to the fact that French Communists at their congress came out with a broad, fundamentally important program directed at nuclear disarmament, strengthening peace, and international cooperation. It seems to us that this is in keeping with the demands of the time and possesses tremendous significance. The world stands on the threshold, perhaps, of the most significant event in the whole postwar period, at the gateway to practical disarmament, movement no longer in words but in deeds toward a safe nuclear-free world. In these conditions, the people demand that each party, each political movement, each statesman and politician should clearly define his position.

At the same time, in Western Europe voices are being heard in favor of the pursuit of a policy of nuclear deterrence, a "nuclear pause," upgrading armaments, creating new missiles in place of the ones being destroyed. This obviously goes against the general current, effectively against the desires of all mankind.

On these issues, the French Communists hold, in our view, a correct stance.

Question by G. Bortoli, French Television Channel 2: In your speech at the PCF congress, you spoke of the possibility of a "round table" conference on disarmament. Do you think another body dealing with disarmament questions will be set up, what countries will take part in it, will any proposals be put forward, and is the talk about it official?

Ye.K. Ligachev: You have correctly noted that in my speech I spoke of the fact that in the new situation now shaping up, especially after the Soviet-U.S. agreement on liquidation of medium- and shorter-range missiles has been concluded, it would be expedient to hold in Europe a "round table" on questions of security. Europe is our common home; we call it the "European home," the "home of our common problems." Therefore, in our view, it would be useful to continue the dialogue among representatives of public and political movements and parties on these major questions.

In Moscow recently, there was a meeting of representatives of parties and movements that took part in the jubilee festivities on the occasion of the 70th anniversary of the October Revolution. You know that it was attended by communists, social democrats, revolutionaries of various directions, and "Greens." This meeting, we think, will promote unification of the workers' and communist movement, of all public forces in the struggle for social progress, for peace and international security. The meeting brought huge satisfaction for all. Represented at it were hundreds of millions of people taking part in various public and political movements. There was a completely free exchange of opinion. No one interrupted anyone, everyone listened attentively. This atmosphere made for a broad discussion of questions. I was in the delegation of the CPSU Central Committee, and I am sharing with you my personal observations. Why should representatives of public organizations of all countries of Europe not gather to examine our common problems? We live on the same continent. We have much in common in history, and quite a lot in common, too, in development of science and culture, in economic and commercial relations. It would be extremely useful if French journalists, too—all of you—supported this idea in the most active way. It would be your contribution to the struggle for peace and international security. It would be a display of new political thinking on international affairs.

Question by R. Conti, Italian television Channel 2: Will relations between the USSR and the United States be limited just to the field of disarmament, or are you counting on developing cooperation in other fields, despite the difference in the political structure of your counties?

Ye.K. Ligachev: We do not believe that our relations with the United States should be limited to a discussion of questions concerning problems of disarmament. Moreover, pursuing a policy of disarmament, we expect that the Soviet-U.S. agreement on liquidation of medium- and shorter-range missiles will be followed not only by an intensification of the process of liquidating armaments but also by a development of processes connected with an expansion and deepening of economic, commercial, cultural, scientific, and other relations. I think that on the agenda of talks that will be held soon between M.S. Gorbachev and R. Reagan they will find definite reflection—at any rate, we hope so.

No, ideological differences do not prevent development of economic, political, cultural, and other relations. Each of us can cite dozens of examples of this. Since history ordained that there are states on the planet with different socioeconomic structures, the most sensible thing—this idea belongs to Lenin—is peaceful coexistence. This assumes the broadest international cooperation. This is our position on this question.

Question by P. Bosev of *Le Figaro*: You said in your interview in *Le Monde* that glasnost should be constructive. What do you mean by that?

Ye.K. Ligachev: I would like to stress that we are realists. We see clearly that everything that has been devised and worked out by our party in the policy of restructuring and renewal—all this can be implemented only if we really do develop democracy in society and, of course, the party, and if we carry out a cardinal economic reform.

V.I. Lenin said some remarkable words about the relationship between the economy and democracy. He said that the economy and democracy do not exist separate from one another. Democracy pushes the economy all the time, and the economy pushes democracy. We take that tenet of Lenin's as our starting point. Via democratization we can in truly real terms involve the popular masses in the running of society, in self-management, and management of the economic mechanism.

But democratization cannot be carried out without glasnost, without criticism and self-criticism. Glasnost, too, is responsibility, trustworthiness, and justice. Consequently, glasnost, in our view, should be constructive. If we were to write endlessly about one thing and nothing else, for example, the work of some particular ministry, collective, party, or local soviet body, but the state of affairs did not change, this would mean that the aim of glasnost had not been achieved. That is the sense in which we believe glasnost should be constructive, that is, it should help improve the work of all areas of society and the whole party. That is what I had in mind when I spoke about the constructiveness of glasnost. At the same time, however, we are aware that glasnost means both providing broad information and involving people in managing social and production affairs. This we will continue unswervingly, going along the path of glasnost and developing it, for there is no other path. Glasnost is both the condition for the success of restructuring and the tool of restructuring.

Question by H. Schattel, second channel of FRG television: How do you assess the French policy of nuclear deterrence in the context of the disarmament process? Have concrete proposals been expressed in this field during your meetings in France?

Ye.K. Ligachev: Now that we are on the eve of signing an agreement that will become the initial step along the path of nuclear disarmament, we consider that the policy of nuclear deterrence is coming into conflict with demands of the times. The policy of nuclear deterrence presupposes modernization of weapons and their replacement with improved ones, that is to say, ones that are more terrible: in other words, an arms race.

Now that we are closely approaching signing an agreement on medium-range and shorter-range missiles, it is very important to step up the struggle for disarmament; it is important for this process to develop in every direction and in all countries. Efforts have to be united in the movement toward firm peace. Such are the demands people make; such are the demands of all mankind.

Question by P. Burra, French Television Channel 1: When will the Red Army leave Afghan territory? We are worried about the fate of the French journalist Guyot. Do you not think that the Soviet leadership could influence the decision of the Afghan Government on the release of our countryman?

V.V. Zagladin: As far as Afghanistan is concerned, as I hope you know, it was stated at the 27th congress of our party that we want our soldiers to return home. Of course, this does not depend on us alone. As the president of Afghanistan has announced, agreement has now been reached that Soviet troops can leave Afghanistan over 12 months or even sooner, if the appropriate conditions are created for that. Virtually the only obstacle to reducing this timescale are the continuing actions by other powers supplying weapons to those fighting the Afghan regime.

The Afghan Government, having adopted the new constitution, has demonstrated its good will for concord, trust, and cooperation with all forces that are prepared for this, without exception. I hope that the forthcoming round of talks between Afghanistan and Pakistan, through the mediation of the representative of the UN secretary general, which will take place at the beginning of 1988, will complete this process, if, of course, nothing unforeseen happens.

As far as the French journalist is concerned, as far as we know, the Afghan Government did not invite him. He did not ask for permission; he entered Afghanistan's territory illegally, and not for the first time. The Afghan authorities are now carrying out an investigation. The president of the republic has stated that this will be completed in the near future. The journalist will then be able to meet representatives of the press: Representatives of the French consulate have already met him. Hitherto the Afghan Government has resolved all questions of this kind in the most merciful way. I am sure that this will be the case on this occasion as well.

More on Paris News Conference

LD042301 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1800 GMT 4 Dec 87

[From the "Vremya" newscast]

[Text] The France-USSR Association is situated in the 16th Arrondissement of Paris. Today the Ligachev-led delegation, which is taking part in the work of the French Communist Party [PFC] congress, visited the association. Comrade Ligachev and members of the delegation were warmly greeted by Madeleine Guilbert, executive president of the association, and other members of the presidential board.

The association's residence is often called the house of Franco-Soviet friendship in Paris. Exhibitions, concerts, or meetings with Soviet people take place here. The delegation and association's leaders held a conversation. Madeleine Guilbert spoke about the multifaceted activity of the USSR's friends in France. She stressed specificially the French response to the meeting between Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev and a large group of the French public held last September in Moscow. Guilbert showed delegation members only a small part of the newspaper clippings, articles, and comments that were published in the French press about that event. It became an important milestone on the road toward strengthening mutual liking and confidence between the two peoples.

Comrade Ligachev conveyed to association members greetings and kind wishes of success from Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev in the noble cause of bringing closer the two great peoples. The head of the CPSU delegation said that Soviet people would celebrate the 200th anniversary of the French Revolution as one of the most prominent dates in modern history and as an important event in the life of a friendly people. Comrade Ligachev spoke about current changes in Soviet society and about this new creative revolutionary process. Many issues were tackled at this friendly meeting, including those on the forthcoming Soviet-U.S. missiles accord, on the hopes that people in various countries are placing on it, and on the need for new important initiatives in the name of strengthening Soviet-French friendship. Finally, Comrade Ligachev gave a decorative panel, "Moscow," as a gift to the association on behalf of the CPSU delegation. Members of the delegation were handed a photograph album with views of Paris. [video shows the talks and exchange of gifts, then cuts to a view of the Soviet Embassy]

At the Soviet Embassy in France today, the CPSU delegation held a news conference. It evoked great interest from representatives of the press, television, and radio. Correspondents of all French television networks, all major organs of the French press, and foreign journalists accredited in Paris attended the news conference. Comrade Ligachev spoke at the news conference. He said, in particular:

[Begin Ligachev recording] As you know, our delegation was invited to the 26th FCP Congress. We responded to the invitation of our friends with gratitude. What can be said about the work of the congress? The last 3 days of its work have been filled with a profound and many-sided discussion of a report by Comrade Georges Marchais, general secretary of the PCF Central Committee that is quite interesting and rich in content. For us, representatives of the CPSU, participation in the work of the PCF congress is quite an interesting and instructive thing. No doubt, Soviet and French Communists are engaged in resolving different tasks. We have different life stories, as the saying goes; we act independently and in a sovereign manner. However, we are far from being indifferent to each other's experience. Mutual pondering over experience by no means implies imitation of any sort, and we have said this more than once. At the same time, Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev emphasizes, this is one of most valuable sources for enriching Marxist-Leninist thinking. Besides, communists have common tasks, such as the struggles for peace, social progress, and international cooperation. In this we are advancing along the same path with French Communists toward a secure and nuclear-free world.

Our attention was drawn to the fact that the positions of the PCF advocating peace, nuclear disarmament, security, and constructive French contribution to the disarmament process were confirmed at the congress. We appreciate the support shown by the French Communists for Soviet initiatives on the issues of peace and disarmament.

During our stay in Paris, we had meetings with Francois Mitterrand, president of the French Republic; Jacques Chirac, French premier; and also Mr Barre, as you know. We see those contacts within the context of continuing deepening of Franco-Soviet dialogue, improving mutual understanding with France in the interests of the peoples of our countries, and strengthening peace and cooperation in Europe and the whole world.

A personal message from Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev was handed to the president. We are prepared to take account of specific features of French policy. In turn, we are hoping that the political decisions and defense program being adopted by France will be oriented toward strengthening security, not through modernization and buildup of arms, but based on considerably reducing the level of armaments without detriment to anyone's security.

Not very much time, 2 and 1/2 years, have passed since the April 1985 CPSU Central Committee Plenum , when the CPSU determined the strategic line toward restructuring and acceleration. We have not succeeded in anything; we are aware of our difficulties; we are aware of our failures. Yet everywhere, literally in all directions, progress has been clearly outlined. This is a fact, an indisputable fact. The moral atmosphere in society is changing crucially, and the dynamism of the country's economic and social development is growing. We realize our responsibility to ourselves, to our people, and to the whole world. The results, the good results of restructuring, will be increasing, whether it be a question of internal or international affairs. [end recording] [video shows cameraman, journalists in the hall; Ligachev sitting on a platform flanked by other Soviet officials identified as D. Patiashvili, V. Zatvornitskiy, and V. Zagladin]

Kondryatev Views FRG Stands on Arms Treaty

LD062132 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1500 GMT 6 Dec 87

[From the "International Panorama" program, presented by Vitaliy Kobysh; Vladimir Kondryatev video talk—Kondryatev identified by screen caption]

[Text] There is no country in Western Europe more affected by a treaty on medium- and short-range missiles than the FRG. It is from the FRG that the idea of upgrading arms emanated and, under the infamous twin-track NATO decision, it was precisely in the FRG that the main part of the missiles to be scrapped were sited. Eight years separate December, 1979, when a new spiral in the arms race took on its real outline, from this December, when the start of disarmament is becoming a reality.

Tracing the way to the agreement that has been worked out, many political figures and journalists in the FRG are voicing the opinion that NATO's firmness on the issue of missile sitings was just what stirred the Soviet Union to make concessions at the talks. The Kremlin's calculations on the antiwar movement have not been justified. Western governments did not give in to pressure from their public which protested introducing into Europe of Pershing and cruise missiles from across the sea, and the world is now reaping the fruits of this, apparently far-sighted approach. Talk like this, however, goes against one's conscience. The missile discussion in the FRG has involved practically the whole population. Attitudes to questions of war and peace have changed fundamentally for millions of people in the country where, it would seem, concern for the burghers' well-being should take priority. This movement has never had such great influence before.

During the deployment of missiles, drawn up in detail for strikes on command centers and missile launch facilities on the territory of the Soviet Union, NATO and the FRG said that their conditions, that is, total rejection of this class of weapons by both sides, would undoubtedly be unacceptable for our country. But the Soviet Union went still further. It agreed to scrap not just medium-range missiles but also operational-tactical missiles. It was then that real confusion on the banks of the Rhine began. It is said that it is bad luck to dwell on the past. I am not going to recall today all the convolutions and Bonn's opposition to the double-zero option. After all, the most responsible politicians there did ultimately find the strength to admit that the burden of responsibility for undermining an historic agreement would be too great for the FRG. Today, one has to look to the future. What will Europe be like after the meeting in Washington and after the accord on two classes of missiles has been reinforced by the signatures of both great powers?

The FRG is now living in anticipation of the meeting. The majority welcome it as a new phase in East-West relations. However, it is already possible to observe how opponents of the double-zero option, who are forced to share the general mood with a heavy heart, are remarshalling their ranks for new attacks. In the words of Minister of Defense Worner, there is a plot now. It is called a significant step on the road to peace with a smaller number of weapons. At the same time, the politician likely soon to become the secretary general of NATO is calling for further steps toward disarmament, especially in the sphere of conventional weapons. True, he pictures this in a fairly peculiar manner. Only the Soviet Union, it turns out, is to reduce its troops and weapons. Right-wing people are manipulating the legal data. Dregger, for example, who is named among the probable successors to the minister of defense, is trying to prove that the Soviet Union has a vast superiority of conventional weapons and short-range and battlefield nuclear weapons. They reject a third nuclear zero option in principle. The fundamental reasoning in favor of the latest upgrading of weapons points to Soviet missiles with a range of up to 500 km. They are claimed to threaten only the federal republic. Forgetting other nuclear weapon carriers, which surpass the Soviet ones in the number of warheads, they lament that the West will only have left in Europe to counter these missiles, 88 Lance missiles with a 120-km range. Here you can see FRG army troops in exercises with them on Crete [video shows exercises]

The tank divisions are faced with just as complex a task. All they have to oppose the East's steel army with is fundamentally new and expensive technology. For the moment, to repeal the speculated tank attacks of the opponent, guided weapons like these are to be used. [video shows weapons] Their defect lies, it is believed here, in the fact that they need to see the strike target constantly. The range of fire is limited to 4,000 m. A revolution is therefore alleged to be required in the conventional arms sphere. Ways to accomplish this are now being worked out.

At first sight, this is an ordinary field howitzer, but the missile it contains has what is called an intelligent filling [intelligentnuyu nachinku], thanks to which it guides itself to its target. Modern electronics permit this. This cartoon shows how the new technology works. The individual warheads [zaryady] divide up after firing. There are three of them. They float toward earth attached to small parachutes. A sensory device in a spiral feels a very large area. As soon as the target is revealed, the warheads are fired. The opponent's tanks can be hit at a distance of up to 20 km. Also in the offing is equipping the FRG army with unmanned reconnaissance planes enabling observations to be conducted at a depth of up to 75 km over the opponent's territory. The FRG, as when it made the decision to upgrade armaments, has once again been talking about zones of vulnerability that must be filled in as quickly as possible. These weapons are even more expensive than nuclear ones, but there is no other alternative, they say to alarm the inhabitants, if the drive to reduce nuclear reserves is continued.

I think it is clear to everyone what implementation of such plans could lead to. The agreement to be signed in Washington should become merely a first step on the road to disarmament and create an atmosphere of greater trust in one another. But what trust can we talk about if instead of reducing the potential, new potential is developed? After all, it is no secret that in their destructive capacity, contemporary conventional arms are getting nearer and nearer to nuclear ones. As is well-known, the Soviet Union is ready to discuss this problem and to cut back whatever it has more on condition that the West also removes its edge on individual positions. This requires constructive talks rather than unilateral violations in an approximate parity.

W. Europe Union Urges Treaty Ratification

PM070945 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 5 Dec 87 First Edition p 5

[TASS report: "WEU Session Completed"]

[Text] Paris 4 December—The latest session of the Assembly of the Western European Union (WEU), a military-political grouping uniting Belgium, Britain, Italy, Luxembourg, the Netherlands, the FRG, and France, has completed its work in the French capital. For 4 days parliamentarians from these countries discussed questions of future WEU activity. The upcoming signing of the Soviet-U.S. treaty on elimination of medium- and shorter-range missiles had a particular impact on the work of the session. Its participants made an appeal to the U.S. Senate to most speedily ratify this treaty, which, in the parliamentarians' view, will serve the long-term interests of NATO and Warsaw Pact countries.

The session unanimously approved the text of a resolution envisaging an invitation from the WEU Assembly to a USSR Supreme Soviet delegation. This invitation, Assembly President Charles Gerens [name as published] stated in an interview with a TASS correspondent, pursues the objective of continuing the exchange of views between the USSR Supreme Soviet and the WEU Assembly begun in April 1987. We intend to discuss questions of disarmament with a view to determining mutually acceptable ways to reduce the military danger.

The parliamentarians also advocated achieving an agreement between the USSR and the United States on reducing strategic nuclear arsenals by 50% while observing the ABM Treaty.

Latin America & Caribbean

Wrecking of Haiti Elections Viewed

PM071437 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 3 Dec 87 Morning Edition p 5

[Yevg. Bay "International Commentary": "Duvalier-Style Methods"]

[Text] The Haitians' hopes of holding the first free elections in the country for 30 years have been dashed. The ruling triumvirate headed by General Namphy has dissolved the Provisional Electoral Council and deferred voting. This happened after members of the former Duvalier secret police, the Tontons Macoutes, created real carnage in Port-au-Prince in their efforts to wreck the elections.

Fears that it would not take place had long been voiced on Haiti. Since the middle of the year, ultrarightists had gone over to open terror against the peaceful population, trying to generate a state of chaos, anarchy, and fear in the country. Since the beginning of November, when the Provisional Electoral Council disqualified 12 presidential contenders who were former supporters of the deposed dictator, reaction set out to wreck the election.

I was able to visit Haiti several months after the collapse of the Duvalier regime. Everything at that time was shaky and ill-defined there. The disposition of forces was extremely unclear: The forces of the left were represented by the United Party of Haitian Communists and the trade unions associated with it, which enjoyed the sympathy of thousands of Haitians reduced to dire poverty. The rightists were represented by former supporters of Duvalier in the army.

The political center consisted of an enormous group of emigres who had returned from exile, whom few people knew anything about. The country reminded me of a river which was about to overflow its banks. On the one hand, there was the ruling junta, on the other, 6 million despairing, homeless, jobless, illiterate Haitians ready to revolt at any moment.

Haiti was a real conundrum for the United States. Which forces should be given preference in this country in turmoil? The Americans banked on the army, which it saw as the only force capable of maintaining this directionless state under relative control.

This year alone military aid to Haiti amounted to $1.7 million. What did this money go on? It went, to cite *The New York Times*, on "'nonlethal supplies'" such as trucks, walkie-talkies, tear gas, shields, and police batons used to stop riots."

"Nonlethal supplies"... In the last few days alone the rightists, under the protection of the army, have killed more than 50 people. I also remember the shooting on a peaceful demonstration at Fort Dimanche in April and the dispersal of demonstrators with tear gas and batons in the middle of the year.

"We are trying," a State Department representative told *The New York Times*, "to take another step toward creating a legitimate government that exercises greater control over the situation and enjoys greater moral authority, making it possible to settle accounts with some of the scum."

What "scum" does the American official have in mind? Scarcely the former members of Duvalier's secret police, the so-called Tontons Macoutes because they were taken under the wing of the American-financed Haitian army. Soon after Duvalier's overthrow, many of the former butchers holed up in the National Palace and army barracks. But gradually they began to crawl out, armed and with the direct connivance of the ruling military junta, in which the chief player is Williams Regala, minister of the interior and national defense, who was a very close aide to Baby Doc.

"Voting was wrecked with the patent connivance of the army and former Duvalier retainers," was how Rockefeller Guerre, a senate contender, (and no friend to the left), commented on the events last Sunday. I think that Washington's hasty decision to stop all military aid (given that a U.S. Navy helicopter carrier was anchored 30 miles off Port-au-Prince, ready to intervene if events in Haiti did not suit Washington) will arouse only a skeptical smile in him and many other Haitian political figures....

General Namphy stated on television that he intends nevertheless to hold general elections by next 7 February. However, the events in Port-au-Prince last Sunday inspire little hope. The wrecking of voting through the efforts of the dictator's former secret police points not to elections but to a Duvalier-style military coup.

Gorbachev Greets Mexican Socialist Party Leader

LD061342 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1312 GMT 6 Dec 87

[Text] Moscow, 6 Dec (TASS)—Mikhail Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, has cordially congratulated Gilberto Gallardo on his election as secretary general of the National Council of the Mexican Socialist Party (MSP). In the telegram, published here today, Mikhail Gorbachev wishes Gilberto Gallardo, the leadership, and members of the MSP success in the struggle for the interests of the working people, for peace, and social progress.

Grossu Confers With Mexican Socialist Gallardo

PM041353 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 2 Dec 87 Second Edition p 4

[Own correspondent N. Ognev dispatch under the general heading: "Official Reports"]

[Text] Mexico City, 1 Dec—A CPSU delegation here, headed by S.K. Grossu, member of the CPSU Central Committee and first secretary of the Moldavian Communist Party Central Committee, has met with Gilberto Rincon Gallardo, secretary general of the Mexican Socialist Party [PMS] National Council.

During the talks, there was an exchange of opinions on urgent questions of the international workers movement. Both sides advocated deepening ties between the CPSU and the PMS.

More on Soviet Delegation in Latin America

Received by Venezuelan Congress

PM041257 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 3 Dec 87 Morning Edition p 4

[TASS report under general heading "Interparliamentary Ties"]

[Text] Caracas, 1 Dec—A group of USSR Supreme Soviet deputies led by G.S. Tarazevich, deputy chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium, which is touring a number of Latin American countries, has been received by the leadership of the Venezuelan Congress. During the conversation, in which Reinaldo Leandro Mora, president of the National Congress; Jose Rodriguez Iturbe, president of the Chamber of Deputies; and other senators and deputies took part, there was a frank exchange of opinions on a number of international problems.

Both sides unanimously agreed that this kind of visit by a parliamentary delegation helps to improve mutual understanding and develop cooperation between the USSR and Venezuela.

J. Rodriguez Iturbe noted the special importance of this particular visit by the group of USSR Supreme Soviet deputies, which has come at a time when the USSR is in the process of restructuring.

G.S. Tarazevich briefed the other side on profound transformations taking place in the USSR which affect every aspect of life in Soviet society. The leader of the group talked about their tour of Latin America. Meetings and conversations held in Mexico, Nicaragua, Costa Rica, and Venezuela have revealed the full coincidence or proximity of views on the most vitally important current issues concerning the struggle for peace and nuclear disarmament. G.S. Tarazevich explained the Soviet position on the question of creating an international economic security system, stressing the interconnection between disarmament and development.

The leader of the group of Soviet parliamentarians noted the important role played by the Contadora Group and the Support Group in the task of finding a political settlement in Central America and highlighted Venezuela's constructive attitude in this matter.

Jose Angel Siliberto, Venezuelan interior minister, who is also temporarily acting as president of the country, received the group of USSR Supreme Soviet deputies led by G.S. Tarazevich, deputy chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium, which is touring a number of Latin American countries.

The sides noted their coincidence of views on matters concerning the struggle for peace and nuclear disarmament.

The group of USSR Supreme Soviet deputies was warmly welcomed at a special session by members of the Venezuelan Congress. Speaking on their behalf, Jose Rodriguez Iturbe, president of the Chamber of Deputies, underlined the importance and usefulness of such parliamentary contacts.

Meet With Peru's Garcia

LD041405 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 0518 GMT 4 Dec 87

[Text] Lima, 4 Dec (TASS)—President Alan Garcia of Peru has received here a group of deputies of the USSR Supreme Soviet, headed by Georgiy Tarazevich, deputy chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium. Topical problems and the state of and prospects for development of Soviet-Peruvian relations were discussed during the conversation. A. Garcia's attention was drawn to the new Soviet foreign policy initiatives, primarily those on restraining the nuclear arms race and preventing its transfer to outer space. It was emphasized that the Soviet Union comes out consistently in favor of a peaceful settlement in Central America.

A. Garcia noted the coincidence or proximity of the positions of Peru and the USSR on fundamental international problems. He called for a further broadening and deepening of relations between the two countries on a mutually advantageous basis in the trade, economic, and scientific-technical fields. The president of Peru highly assessed the processes of restructuring and democratization occurring in all spheres of life of Soviet society.

A meeting also took place between the Soviet parliamentarians and Armando Villanueva, general secretary of the ruling Peruvian APRA party. During a conversation, in which leading Peruvian officials and public figures took part, an exchange of opinions was held on questions concerning the current international situation, regional conflicts, and acceleration of bilateral relations on the basis of principles of respect for and noninterference in internal matters.

RSFSR's Orlov Returns to Moscow From Havana

PM031627 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 2 Dec 87 Morning Edition p 4

[TASS report under general heading "Official Reports"]

[Text] V.P. Orlov, chairman of the RSFSR Supreme Soviet Presidium, who was in the Republic of Cuba at the invitation of the National Assembly of the People's Government, has returned from Havana to Moscow.

Fidel Castro Receives Rybakov-Led Delegation

PM071409 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 3 Dec 87 Second Edition p 5

[TASS report: "Interparty Ties"]

[Text] A delegation of CPSU party workers headed by O.K. Rybakov, deputy chief of a CPSU Central Committee Department, was in Cuba 24 through 30 November at the invitation of the Communist Party of Cuba [PCC] Central Committee to participate in the Havana City report and election party conference and to familiarize itself with the PCC's work in leading the socialist economy and further deepening Soviet-Cuban cooperation.

The delegation was received by Fidel Castro, first secretary of the PCC Central Committee and president of the Councils of State and Ministers.

Political & Social

Central Committee Discusses Restructuring

PM070919 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 5 Dec 87 Second Edition p 1

[PRAVDA headline: "Conference at the CPSU Central Committee"]

[Text] At the CPSU Central Committee today the leaders of ministries and central economic departments and senior functionaries of the CPSU Central Committee held a conference on the state of affairs and tasks concerning the preparation of industrial sectors, enterprises, and organizations for the transition to full financial autonomy and self-financing.

The conference was opened with an introductory address by Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee.

A statement on progress in preparing industries, enterprises, and scientific organizations for work under the new economic management conditions was presented by Comrade Mozhin, first deputy head of the Economic Department of the CPSU Central Committee.

The conference heard about the work that has been done in this area from Voronin, deputy chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers and chairman of the USSR State Committee for Material and Technical Supply; Garetovskiy, chairman of the board of the USSR state bank; and USSR Ministers Anfimov, Lukyanenko, Busygin, Kolpakov, Shkabardnya, and A.A. Shchepetilnikov.

Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev addressed the conference.

Emphasis was laid on the tremendous political significance of the coming transition of the main part of industrial enterprises and building, transport and scientific organizations to full financial autonomy and self-financing. The reform of economic management, inseparably linked with democratization, is the main content of the new stage of restructuring our society.

It was noted that ministries and departments, enterprises, organizations, and local party and soviet bodies are conducting preparatory work for the transition to the new economic management conditions, taking account the law on the state enterprise, enforced as of 1 January 1988. The level of preparation of enterprises and ministries and departments for work under the new conditions determines to a decisive extent the highly efficient and successful work of work collectives.

Attention was drawn to the fact that there is a grave underappraisal of this work at a number of ministries and departments and at many enterprises and organizations. Therefore, it is very important as soon as possible to remove from all sectors the substantial shortfalls in work in the material and technical supplies and planning and financing systems and in implementing measures of a technical, organizational, and financial nature directly at enterprises.

The conference concentrated the attention of the leaders of ministries, departments, and party and soviet bodies on the need during the time remaining in the current year to ensure the definite solution of a number of important tasks. This applies in particular to working out and precisely specifiying economic norms and state orders, and completing the campaign for contracting between suppliers and consumers. All this should be arranged, taking into account strict compliance with the state enterprise law and the interests of the national economy and work collectives.

Requiring special attention are questions connected with improving the financial position of individual associations and enterprises. For this purpose each should draw up the appropriate economic, technical, and organizational measures. Ministries and central departments need to consider the matters arising in this connection. The banking system must join more actively in this work. Great importance must be attached to the widespread application of the achievements of scientific and technological progress and resource saving technological processes.

Serious attention was drawn to the need for a good balance between the planned tasks and material and technical provisions for them. At many enterprises there is in practice no restructuring of internal production financial autonomy and there are no provisions for getting it through directly to the workers. It is essential on the basis of the economic reform requirements to concentrate attention on these matters and on the widespread introduction of the collective contract.

The state of affairs regarding economic training needs to be considerably improved. Many economic schools and seminars are still operating in the old way, and ministries and departments, trade union organizations, and economic managers are slow to join in this work. There is insufficient participation by the mass information media in this universal economic training and in covering the progress of the preparations of enterprises and sectors for work under the new economic management conditions.

The country is entering a very crucial period of restructuring. Essentially from the start of next year many party committees and economic leaders at all levels will have their maturity checked. And the task is to pass this test with confidence and strive to accelerate the country's economic and social development by relying on new forms and methods of economic management.

N.I. Ryzhkov, member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers; L.N. Zaykov, member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo, secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, and first secretary of Moscow CPSU Gorkom; V.I. Dolgikh, candidate member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and secretary of the CPSU Central Committee; CPSU Central Committee secretaries A.P. Biryukova and G.P. Razumovskiy; deputy chairmen of the USSR Council of Ministers, and chiefs of CPSU Central Committee departments took part in the conference's work.

Government Expresses Thanks for GOSR Greetings

LD051828 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1600 GMT 5 Dec 87

[Text] The CPSU Central Committee, the Presidium of the USSR Supreme Soviet and the USSR Council of Ministers express profound gratitude to the Soviet and foreign citizens, state and public organizations, parties, movements, and governments, that sent their congratulations and greetings in connection with the 70th anniversary of the Great October Socialist Revolution.

The Great October Revolution anniversary celebration was a major political event. It convincingly showed the complexity and grandeur of the historic path that has been travelled by the Soviet people and the broad scale and worldwide significance of our achievements, and has brought us through to fresh frontiers in interpreting what we have been through and in clarifying the lessons of the past.

The greetings that were received from representatives of the working class, the kolkhoz peasantry and intelligentsia, and from veterans and young people, reflect their deep understanding of restructuring as a genuine embodiment of Lenin's ideas and the ideas of the Great October Revolution. They are vivid testimony to the high political enthusiasm and spiritual mood of Soviet people and their desire to make their own contribution to implementing the decisions of the 27th CPSU Congress, subsequent CPSU Central Committee plenums, and to the party's course of restructuring and revitalizng all spheres of our life. Those exciting documents manifest with fresh force Soviet patriotism and the unbreakable fraternal friendship between the peoples of the USSR.

The numerous congratulations and greetings received from countries abroad reflect the very widespread response that the 70th anniversary of the Great October Revolution produced throughout the whole world. We see in this a tribute of respect and recognition of our revolution as a worldwide historic turnabout in mankind's destiny and for the homeland of the Great October and its active, leading role in the struggle for peace and social progress.

We are grateful to the parties and governments, public organizations, work collectives, and the thousands of citizens of the socialist countries for their congratulations, which express their full support for the course of the CPSU and fraternal parties toward the total development of relations between socialist states and toward a more extensive and effective interaction in the interests of the successful construction of a new society and the consolidation of peace. The CPSU states anew that the main priority in the Soviet Union's international policy will continue toward a deepening of friendship and cooperation with socialist countries.

We are grateful to the leaders of communist and workers' parties, revolutionary democratic, socialist, social democratic, and labor parties, and to the mass democratic organizations and movements, that sent congratulations to the Soviet people and our party. The congratulations show the mounting interest of the world public in the ideas of restructuring being implemented in the USSR and their progress, and of the CPSU's decision to remove the threat of a nuclear catastrophe and to create an all-embracing international security system. We confirm our desire to cooperate with parties and organizations that express the will and interests of the working class, democratic, liberation, and antiwar movements.

The congratulations sent to the Soviet Union and our people by the heads of foreign states and their governments reflect the mounting realization of the need to remove the threat of war and to solve other cardinal problems affecting all mankind. Our country will do everything it can, together with other states and on the basis of the new political thinking, to solve these problems and to ensure the survival of mankind and the progress of civilization.

The CPSU Central Committee, the Presidium of the USSR Supreme Soviet, and the USSR Council of Ministers call on the working people of the Soviet Union to display the heroism and selflessness characteristic of all generations of Soviet people in implementing the general line of the CPSU. It is important to consolidate and redouble the political enthusiasm produced by the celebrations marking the 70th anniversary of the Great October Revolution. Restructuring has now entered a fresh stage. The process of democratization and glasnost is being deepened, and implementation of the radical reform of the economic mechanism is beginning. The main thing now is to concentrate all efforts on specific deeds and intensive creative work for the sake of the country's peaceful and happy future.

Kiev Plenum on Continuing Chernobyl Problems

PM041445 Moscow SOTSIALISTICHESKAYA INDUSTRIYA in Russian 4 Dec 87 p 2

[Special correspondent L. Sotnik report: "Extensive Tasks and Limited Solutions. From the Kiev Ukrainian Communist Party Obkom Plenum"]

[Excerpt] [Passage omitted] A great deal was expected of the Kiev Obkom Plenum and thorough preparations were made for it. The bureau members met with gorkom and raykom secretaries, addressed workers at the oblispolkom apparatus, the Komsomol obkom, justice organs, and oblast economic organizations, and visited primary party organizations and labor collectives. The oblast newspaper *Kiyevskaya Pravda* published an appeal from the party obkom to all inhabitants of the oblast to send their suggestions to the newspaper and to party and soviet organs. Obkom departments collated the proposals, remarks, and letters with cutting critical "barbs" leveled against dozens of party, soviet, and economic organizations. Glasnost is glasnost is glasnost. A week before the plenum *Kiyevskaya Pravda* published the theses of the report which G. Revenko, obkom first secretary, was to present at the plenum.

But the more I listened to the text of the report at the plenum and the speeches by the speakers, the stronger was my sense of dissatisfaction. I had hoped that the innovations in the preparations for the plenum would have been translated into innovative work by the entire forum of the oblast's Communists. Naturally, I am not referring to new phraseology, but to the search for and adoption of specific decisions. Unfortunately, the oft-repeated appeals along the lines of "improve," "deepen," and "focus on" did not represent concrete actions.

Let us start with the specific features of the oblast, the most important facts about its life. It is here that the regrettably famous Chernobyl AES is located. This tragedy was a shockingly severe lesson for scientists, station operators, and politicians. It was a microcosm of our many faults and shortcomings: negligence, thoughtlessness, reliance on things turning out all right, poor executive discipline.... The lessons of Chernobyl are being learned today not only by us but by the whole world.... I thought that the plenum participants would, if not spotlight Chernobyl, at least devote quite a considerable amount of time to it. Alas, in the 78-page report only one paragraph was devoted to the subject of Chernobyl. This is it:

"Thanks to the immense help from the CPSU Central Committee, the USSR Council of Ministers, the Ukrainian Communist Party Central Committee, the republic's government, and the governments of other fraternal republics and to the selfless labor of many collectives, the paramount tasks of eliminating the consequences of the disaster have been largely resolved."

Is that it? I expressed my surprise at this to N. Donchenko, obkom secretary:

"Does this mean you believe there is no cause for alarm, that all the conclusions have been drawn, and that the situation has stabilized?"

"Yes, that is largely correct."

Unfortunately, I cannot share the obkom secretary's optimism. Evidence is provided, for instance, by the materials of the party conference held in the town of Slavutich—the center that is being built for the Chernobyl power workers—on the eve of the obkom plenum. Here are a few extracts from the report by V. Lukyanenko, first secretary of the party gorkom:

"A great deal has now been done at the station to improve the standard (the safety standard—L.S.) of the operational reactors and enhance the reliability of the shielding, but by no means everything has been done to foster a high sense of responsibility for individual assignments among all the workers. Various accidents happen periodically through the fault of the personnel. In June the party gorkom bureau was forced to assess the blatant violations committed by the personnel during the work to extract (fuel—L.S.) assembly 50-21 at power unit No 2. The party obkom bureau instituted party proceedings against Ye.I. Ignatenko, general director of the "Kombinat" Production Association; M.P. Umanets, director of the station; and Ye.A. Borodavko, party committee secretary at the station, for failing to ensure the proper standard of technological discipline. ...But what puts us on our guard is that the station personnel have not developed any immunity against violations of technological discipline, and such violations do not generate acute reactions at the party committee or the shop party organizations. They start reacting only when pressed.... In the last 10 months there have been 36 accidents in our organizations, including three fatal accidents.... Despite the measures that are being taken, cases of overexposure to radiation have still not been ruled out.... Industrial safety questions have not become paramount for economic leaders or trade union organizations, and the personal responsibility of workers themselves is low."

Clearly some oblast leaders consider these alarming facts to be trivial against the backdrop of the Chernobyl catastrophe, but it is worth remembering that both the explosion and the fire started with what were virtually invisible trivial matters. So can this be left unattended? [passage omitted]

Ukraine CP CC Commemorates October Jubilee

AU302141 Kiev PRAVDA UKRAINY in Russian 25 Nov 87 pp 1, 3

[Unattributed report: "In the Ukrainian Communist Party Central Committee"—passages in boldface as published]

[Text] **The Ukrainian Communist Party Central Committee Politburo has examined the issue of the 70th anniversary of the proclamation of Soviet rule in the Ukraine.**

The adopted decision notes that the Soviet Ukraine's working people, along with all Soviet people, solemnly, and in an atmosphere of increased activity by Communists and non-party members, commemorated the 70th anniversary of the Great October Socialist Revolution as a political landmark. This outstanding jubilee was celebrated all over the republic in the spirit of Leninist traditions, efficiency, modesty, and mutual exactingness.

The report delivered by M. S. Gorbachev, CPSU Central Committee general secretary, at the ceremonious session in Moscow, "The October and Restructuring: the Revolution Is Continuing," was received with great satisfaction. It has profoundly revealed the heroic path covered by our country in the 7 post-October decades; on the basis of a thorough political analysis, it has interpreted the most important periods of socialist construction in a new way, as well as the changes which have taken place in our state and in the world, and has creatively developed the ideas which constitute the basis of the party line aimed at restructuring and at the accelerated socioeconomic development of the country. The Communists and all people of the Soviet Ukraine fully share and support the report's theses, appraisals, and conclusions which are of principled importance for the entire party activity and for the life of Soviet society.

The beginning of the socialist epoch in the Ukraine was inseparably linked with the revolutionary changes brought about by the Great October. Along with the Russian proletariat and all the revolutionary masses of Russia, the Ukraine's workers and peasants took an active part in the bitter class battles against the landlords and capitalists. Having overcome the embittered resistance of the exploiting classes and of the bourgeois nationalist counterrevolution, they came out resolutely in favor of establishing people's rule, the rule of the Soviets.

The first All-Ukrainian Congress of the Soviets, held in Kharkov on 24-25 December 1917, was a turning point in the struggle to implement the revolutionary ideals. In expressing the vital interests of the absolute majority of the Ukrainian people, the congress proclaimed Soviet rule and the formation of the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic. Guided by the Leninist legacy that "a free Ukraine is only possible when the Great Russian and the Ukrainian proletarians act in a united way, and without such unity it is out of the question," the congress resolved to establish state links between the Ukraine and Soviet Russia.

In the revolutionary struggle for the rule of the Soviets, the Ukrainian people were guided by the party of the Bolsheviks, with Lenin at the head. The First Congress of the Ukrainian Communist Party (of the Bolsheviks), which completed the process of uniting Bolshevik organizations all over the Ukraine and which organized the Communist Party of the Ukraine as an integral part of the Russian Communist Party (of the Bolsheviks), showed that the republic's Communists comprehended the Leninist ideas very well.

The creation of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics was the continuation of the cause of Great October, a result of the creativity of all nations and nationalities. The working people of the Soviet Ukraine were among the first to support the creation of the USSR. In a fraternal formation with the great Russian people and other peoples of our country, they set about accomplishing the tasks set for socialist construction. Their unity hardened and strengthened in the process of industrialization, of the collectivization of agriculture in the severe years of the Great Patriotic War, and in the period of the post-war rebirth of the national economy.

The 7 decades of the republic's development is convincing evidence that Soviet rule had ensured the reconstruction of society on socialist principles. In past years, the Soviet Ukraine turned into an industrial republic with multibranched agriculture. The material and intellectual living standards of the population rose significantly.

Under present conditions, when the party and the people are pursuing the line traced by the 27th CPSU Congress toward restructuring, toward the renewal of all spheres of life, and toward promoting democracy and glasnost by all means, the republic's working people consider it their patriotic and internationalist duty to redouble the country's material and intellectual wealth, and to find optimal solutions for the tasks put forward by life.

The Ukrainian Communist Party Central Committee has resolved to commemorate the 70th anniversary of the proclamation of Soviet rule and of the formation of the Ukrainian SSR as an important political event, as a great festive occasion in the life of the Ukrainian people. The republic's obkoms, gorkoms, raykoms, and basic party organizations; administrative, trade union, and Komsomol organs; ministries and departments; public organizations and creative unions have been instructed to be guided by the CPSU Central Committee decisions on the political results of the commemoration of the 70th anniversary of the Great October Socialist Revolution, and to ensure that the universal historic significance of the triumph won by the Great October is widely expounded, to thoroughly show the triumph of socialist ideas, to reveal the close connections between the accomplishments of the October Revolution and the present radical changes taking place in the country, and to foster the people's faith in restructuring. They have been instructed to regard it as their highly important task to consolidate and to redouble production and the public and political activity among the working people that is stimulated by the preparations for and celebration of the 70th anniversary of the Great October, and for this purpose make full use of the party committee plenums and the meetings which are being held by the Communists at present to examine accountability reports on control over restructuring presented by elective organs.

In connection with the jubilee, provisions have been made for the following events:

A joint solemn session of the Ukrainian Communist Party Central Committee and the Ukrainian Supreme Soviet is to be held in Kiev on 25 December, with the participation of representatives of party, administrative, and public organizations, of Kiev city and oblast working people, and of the Soviet Army.

Joint solemn sessions of obkoms, gorkoms, raykoms and the corresponding soviets of people's deputies are to be held in December, with the participation of representatives of public organizations and military units.

A republic-level creative conference of men of letters and critics is to be held in Kharkov on 14-17 December, entitled: "The Great October, Restructuring, Literature."

Public political readings, lectures, subject soirees, film festivals, art shows, sports competitions, and other events are to be organized in November and December of the current year.

Party veterans, participants in the struggle for Soviet rule in the Ukraine and from the Civil and the Great Patriotic Wars, ideological aktivists, scientists, advanced production workers, and innovators marching in the vanguard of restructuring are to be widely engaged in this work.

Pains wills be taken to ensure that all jubilee events take place in a businesslike and creative atmosphere. Party, trade union, and Komsomol organizations, administrative, and public organizations should focus their attention on key tasks that determine the destiny of restructuring: on the democratization of public life and on the radical economic reform. Advantage will be taken of the jubilee in order to mobilize labor collectives for the successful fulfillment of the 1987 plans, to meet the 5-year targets, to further raise the effectiveness of communal production and the quality of goods, to settle social problems, and to foster the political unity, friendship, and brotherhood of the Soviet Ukraine's working people with all peoples of the USSR.

The editorial boards of the newspapers *Radyanska Ukraina, Pravda Ukrainy, Rabochaya Gazeta*, of the journals *Kommunist Ukrainy* and *Pod Znamenem Leninizma*, of oblast, city, and rayon papers, the Ukrainian State Committee for Television and Radio Broadcasting, and *Ratau* have been commissioned to broadly highlight the preparations for and celebration of the 70th anniversary of the proclamation of Soviet rule in the Ukraine and of the formation of the Ukrainian SSR.

Shcherbitskiy Attends

PM041141 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 28 Nov 87 Second Edition p 2

[TASS report: "Republic Conference"]

[Text] Kiev, 27 Nov—The October armed uprising in Petrograd and the First All-Ukrainian Congress of Soviets, which proclaimed Soviet power in the Ukraine and the formation of the Ukrainian SSR, were separated by just 6 weeks. The fact that the dates of these historic events stand side by side is a source of special pride for the working people of the republic. The Ukrainian people date their socialist calendar from October. This was stressed at a republic scientific and theoretical conference entitled "Following the Course of Restructuring Under the Banner of Great October," which opened in Kiev today. It is devoted to the 70th anniversary of Great October and the 70th anniversary of the establishment of Soviet power in the Ukraine. Participants include party veterans, social scientists, VUZ lecturers, and the party and propaganda aktiv.

The reports by G.L. Smirnov, director of the CPSU Central Committee Institute of Marxism-Leninism and corresponding member of the USSR Academy of Sciences, Academician B.Ye. Paton, president of the Ukrainian Academy of Sciences, and other participants noted that the gigantic potential of socialism and its historical advantages and prospects have clearly been demonstrated during Soviet society's existence. The Soviet Ukraine, which has scaled great heights in developing the economy, science, and culture within the harmonious family of fraternal republics, clearly exemplifies this. At the same time, the large-scale restructuring of all spheres of social life launched in the country in line with the decisions of the CPSU Central Committee April (1985) Plenum and the 27th party congress demand a new interpretation of the results and lessons of the socialist revolution.

Conference participants paid great attention to the tasks of improving sociological research in the republic. It was said that timid theoretical thinking is acting as a brake on restructuring. And it is an important task of the conference to soberly examine stagnant phenomena in science, outline effective and realistic ways of removing them, and analyze what has been done by Ukrainian social scientists in past years in a serious, unprejudiced, and critical way. Scientists must pay closer attention to research into processes in the sphere of national relations and improving the theory and practice of international education.

The conference was addressed by V.V. Shcherbitskiy, member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and first secretary of the Ukrainian Communist Party Central Committee.

The conference continues.

Shcherbitskiy Speaks

AU3031253 Kiev PRAVDA UKRAINY in Russian 28 Nov 87 pp 1, 3

[RATAU report: "Along the Line of Restructuring Under the Banner of the Great October"]

[Text] A republic-level scientific theoretical conference dedicated to the 70th anniversary of the Great October Socialist Revolution and of the establishment of Soviet rule in the Ukraine opened in Kiev on 27 November under the title "Along the Line of Restructuring Under the Banner of the Great October." The conference was organized by the Ukrainian Academy of Sciences, the

Institute of the History of the Party under the Ukrainian Communist Party Central Committee—a branch of the Institute of Marxism-Leninism under the CPSU Central Committee—the Higher Party School under the Ukrainian Communist Party Central Committee, and the Ukrainian Ministry of Higher and Secondary Special Education. Participating in the conference proceedings were party veterans, members of the Ukrainian Academy of Sciences, experts in social sciences, lecturers at higher educational institutions, party, Komsomol, and propaganda aktivists. V. V. Shcherbitskiy, CPSU Central Committee Politburo member and Ukrainian Communist Party Central Committee first secretary, delivered the opening speech. The Great October Socialist Revolution, he said, holds an indisputable central place among this century's events. Accomplished under the guidance of the party of the Bolsheviks, it marked a turning point in the history of our homeland and of the world. Every October jubilee confirms with new strength Vladimir Ilich Lenin's prophetic words: "The farther that great day moves away from us, the clearer the significance of the proletarian revolution in Russia becomes." And this is natural. Having marked the beginning of a new epoch and of a new type of human civilization, Great October continues to exert enormous influence on all aspects of international developments. Our new society has been in existence for a mere 7 decades, but that time has been sufficient to clearly manifest the great possibilities of socialism and its historic advantages and prospects. The present October jubilee is further proof how viable and harmonious with our times its ideas are, and how powerful is the potential of revolutionary renewal is that is inherent in these ideas.

In his report at the solemn session in Moscow M. S. Gorbachev, CPSU Central Committee general secretary, provided an example of the creative application of Marxism-Leninism in a comprehensive analysis of very complex domestic and international problems involving the past and how it interrelates with the present day. No doubt, the report's theses and conclusions have given a powerful impulse to the deep scientific interpretation of complex past developments, have enabled us to clearly see our prospects and tasks, and have induced us to resolutely renounce obsolete dogmas and stereotypes.

The large-scale restructuring that has developed—in line with the decisions of the April 1985 CPSU Central Committee plenum and of the 27th party congress—in all spheres of the country's public life calls for a new interpretation of the results and lessons of the socialist revolution. When we say that restructuring is the direct continuation of the cause initiated by the Great October, we are not simply paying tribute to a tradition. The Great October provided a great ideological and moral potential for future generations. This is precisely why the Soviet people are so firmly aspiring to restore active links between the past and the present, to understand the significance of the historical experience of the revolution and of socialist construction, and to find out what guiding lines are to be taken from the past and applied to the present day.

Our conference, V. V. Shcherbitskiy pointed out, is dedicated to the 70th anniversary of the Great October and of the establishment of Soviet rule in the Ukraine. The Ukraine's working people take particular pride in the fact that these two dates are so close, that the first All-Ukrainian Congress of the Soviets took place only a month and a half after the armed October uprising in Petrograd. For the Ukrainian people, the Great October marked the beginning of their socialist chronology, and this is the date with which they associate the beginning of their authentic national rebirth. However, we would not be able to act in a Leninist way if we failed to learn useful, although occasionally bitter lessons from our experience. The problems facing us at present are complex and varied, but the time history grants us to resolve them is rather short. We must resolutely get rid of everything that is outdated and ineffective, and, at the same time, must—on the run, as they say—create new things that correspond to the spirit and tasks of the present time.

The important thing in this rather complex undertaking is to invigorate science, primarily social science, by all means. Our conference is called on to accomplish precisely this task. The organizers have called it a scientific theoretical conference—rightly so, in my opinion. After all, it is no secret that timidity in theoretical thinking is one of the factors that hinder restructuring. This was correctly stated at the 27th party congress and at the January and June 1987 CPSU Central Committee plenums. Of course, there were causes for the presence of stagnation in science. One of the tasks confronting the conference is to soberly examine these and to outline effective and realistic ways to eliminate them.

V. V. Shcherbitskiy then tackled ways to perfect social research in the republic. I think, he said, the time has come to scrutinize the republic's achievements in social sciences in a serious and unbiased, but also critical and business-like, way. This will help us to more resolutely give up a number of traditional attitudes. Many of these have proven to be valueless. A self-critical evaluation of achievements is undoubtedly important in reaching a new level in drawing general scientific conclusions. Life itself has created qualitatively new tasks for the social sciences. After all, without the development of revolutionary theory, a revolutionary advance is at present as impossible as it was in V. I. Lenin's times.

Representatives of historical sciences, and primarily of the party's history, are expected to expand the study of the enormous experience accumulated by the party and the people in their creative activity. For this purpose, it is essential to more boldly and responsibly analyze the so-called "blank spots" in our history. It is also important to bear this in mind when preparing "An Outline of the History of the Ukrainian Communist Party" and other publications.

Learned economists are called on to reach a qualitatively new level in their research into the dialectics of socialist production forces and production relations, and to make a concrete contribution to the restructuring of planning, and of the financial, credit, and pricing mechanism. Reliable scientific substantiation is needed in view of the new USSR law on state enterprises (association), which is to come into effect on 1 January 1988, and of the wide application of full economic accountability and self-financing. The development of Soviet democracy and people's self-government, and the consolidation of socialist legality and of law and order—these are the topical subjects for the social sciences. They are also expected to make a considerable contribution to improving the republic's legislation.

More active efforts by philosophers and other experts in social sciences are required in particular to further elaborate the theory of socialism as an integral developing system, the problem of man as the main goal and the decisive force of social progress, and the sum total of the social and moral values of the people.

In our opinion, the Presidium of the Ukrainian Academy of Sciences should examine the progress made in implementing the republic's comprehensive program for topical problems concerning communist education and should amplify and supplement the tasks set for research in this field.

Scientists are also expected to pay more attention to research into the processes taking place in the sphere of nationality relations, as well as to improvements in the theory of internationalist education. It must be kept in mind that miscalculations and defects in this sphere may provide fertile ground for all kinds of speculations, and even for antisocial phenomena. The decision adopted recently by the CPSU Central Committee on the problems of intensified internationalist and patriotic education, and the appropriate decisions of the Ukrainian Communist Party Central Committee direct social sciences toward a profound scientific and class treatment of these phenomena and processes.

A business-like relationship with practical applications is an important factor in restructuring social sciences, as well as all sciences. The theoretical interpretation of the novel and unique nature of the tasks that are being accomplished now should pave the way for their being put into practice and should draw from the same practice materials for new general conclusions and for social forecasts. Under the present conditions of restructuring, it is more important than ever to ensure that science anticipates developments and that the problems brought forward by life are presented clearly and treated profoundly. At the same time, it is very important to concentrate efforts on the main sectors, and to carry out research in a well-thought-out and coordinated manner. In this respect, there is something for the Academy's Presidium to think about, as well as for all experts in the social sciences.

In conclusion, on behalf of the Ukrainian Communist Party Central Committee, V.V. Shcherbitskiy welcomed the conference participants and wished them fruitful work.

The following reports were delivered at the plenary session of the conference: "The Historical Experience of October, and Restructuring," by G. L. Smirnov, director of the Institute of Marxism-Leninism under the CPSU Central Committee and corresponding member of the USSR Academy of Sciences; "October and the Development of Science," by Academician B. Ye. Paton, president of the Ukrainian Academy of Sciences; "The CPSU at the Head of the Restructuring of Soviet Society," by V. I. Yurchuk, director of the Institute of the History of the Party under the Ukrainian Communist Party Central Committee—a branch of the Institute of Marxism-Leninism under the CPSU Central Committee; and "The State Conceived by October: the Creation of Ukrainian Socialist Statehood," by Yu. Yu. Kondufor, director of the History Institute of the Ukrainian Academy of Sciences and member of the Ukrainian Academy of Sciences.

The conference proceedings were attended by Yu. N. Yelchenko, B. V. Kachura, A. A. Titarenko, V. S. Shevchenko, S. I. Gurenko, Yu. A. Kolomiyets, and V. D. Kryuchkov, Ukrainian Communist Party Central Committee Politburo members and candidate members; V. G. Urchukin, Ukrainian Council of Ministers deputy chairman; G. I. Revenko, Kiev Obkom first secretary; K. I. Masik, Kiev Gorkom first secretary; L. M. Kravchuk and F. M. Rudich, department chiefs in the Ukrainian Communist Party Central Committee.

The conference continued its proceedings on 28 November.

More on Ryzhkov, Zaykov Electronics Visit

PM031527 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 2 Dec 87 Second Edition p 2

[TASS report: "High-Class Radio Equipment"]

[Text] At the USSR Ministry of the Communications Equipment Industry on 1 December, N.I. Ryzhkov, member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers, and L.N. Zaykov, member of the Politburo, secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, and first secretary of Moscow CPSU Gorkom, familiarized themselves with the exhibits at a specialized exhibition of domestic electronic equipment in which modern models of television and radio equipment reflecting the achievements of Soviet industry are on show.

Questions connected with realizing an important constituent part of the Comprehensive Program for the Development of Consumer Goods Production and the Services Sphere During 1986-2000 were examined.

It was pointed out that since the CPSU Central Committee April Plenum, a significant step forward has been taken in extending the range and enhancing the technical standard of radio products. The lag behind foreign models has been reduced. The pace of product renewal has been increased substantially.

At the same time, the lag of the chemical, electrical equipment, and metallurgical industries in starting up and increasing production of the modern materials and subassemblies needed to produce complex radio equipment remains a restraining factor in the development of production of this equipment.

The task has been set of significantly increasing production of competitive domestic electronic equipment meeting world technical standards by 1990 in order to satisfy the population's requirements for television sets, radio receivers, and tape recorders, as well as to sharply enhance the standard of technical servicing of equipment.

To this end, it is necessary to substantially increase the volume and effectiveness of scientific research, including by Moscow scientific research institutes and design bureaus, where considerable scientific and technical potential is concentrated. It is important to concentrate production of television and radio equipment at large specialized enterprises, persistently carrying out their modernization and retooling on the basis of progressive technologies and high production standards.

Participating in the examination of questions were L.A. Voronin, Yu.D. Maslyukov, B.L. Tolstykh, and B.Ye. Shcherbina, deputy chairmen of the USSR Council of Ministers; V.G. Afonin and O.S. Belyakov, chiefs of CPSU Central Committee departments; and leaders of a number of ministries and central departments.

Demichev at Construction Industry Session

LD050044 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1200 GMT 4 Dec 87

[Text] A joint session of the construction and construction materials industry commissions of the chambers of the USSR Supreme Soviet was held today. It discussed progress by the Ministry of Construction [words indistinct] in implementation of the decision on improving the efficiency and quality of output and ensuring the commissioning of capacities and projects on schedule. Deputies thoroughly examined the achievements of the industry at the end of the year. It was noted that a particularly great shortfall has been permitted by central directorates operating in Bryansk, Kirov, Novgorod, and Ryazan Oblasts. There was sharp discussion of the organization of the labor of collectives on construction sites and at enterprises, economics, and thrift. Particular attention was paid to matters pertaining to improving the labor, every-day life, and leisure of builders. Recommendations aimed at eliminating the shortcomings were drawn up through collective efforts.

Taking part in the session were Demichev, candidate member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and first deputy chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium, and leaders from a number of ministries and departments.

Vorotnikov Ends Visit to Tambov Oblast

LD061046 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1800 GMT 5 Dec 87

[From the "Vremya" newscast]

[Text] Today Vitaliy Ivanovich Vorotnikov ended his trip in Tambov Oblast.

The pilot enterprise of the Tambov tannery association is situated in the town of Passkazovo. Vitaliy Ivanovich Vorotnikov visited it. The enterprise produces velour, leather with a special coating. The collective of the tannery association is today striving to establish contractual deliveries and direct links with partners in many towns in the country. Talking to its workers, Comrade Vorotnikov emphasized that such forms of interaction with consumers and the introduction of financial autonomy will finally help to improve the quality of footwear and other consumer goods.

The Komintern kolkhoz in Michurinskiy Rayon: Inspecting the swine-breeding complex, the chairman of the RSFSR Council of Ministers noted that there must be a striving to lower the production cast and increase the profits yielded by swine-breeding, and mainly, that it should meet the requirements of the inhabitants of Tambov.

Ways of intergrating science with production was the subject of discussion during a meeting with staff from scientific establishments from the town of Michurinsk. It is essential to accelerate the development of intensive techniques for cultivating fruit and berry crops. The crops that have been grown must reach the consumer in its totality, and that requires effective means for harvesting and storing.

Vitaliy Ivanovich Vorotnikov addressed a plenum of Tambov Obkom. At the new year, he said, the USSR law on the enterprise association comes into effect. Enterprises and organizations from 11 branches in the republic, which account for over half of industrial output in the RSFSR, will transfer to conditions of full financial autonomy and self-financing. The main thing right now, as the party's Central Committee emphasizes, is to teach independence to economic cadres and to overcome the old habit of working on instructions from above. Significant attention was devoted by the chairman of the RSFSR Council of Ministers to the issue of forming modern organizational structures to manage the economy. The aim of this work, he emphasized, is to set up a real foundation for transferring to primarily economic methods of management. A substantial renovation is required in the forms and methods of the activity of party organizations, their electoral bodies, and those means by which they will affect public life. The period of stagnation, Vitaliy Ivanovich Vorotnikov said in conclusion, brought our society many complex problems, and restructuring must put an end to them. The way to resolve this task is clear: It is now down to real day-to-day persistent work.

Prosecutor Interviewed on Drug Addiction

LD051011 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1530 GMT 4 Dec 87

[Text] A conference on the state of affairs in the fight against drug addiction took place in the office of the public prosecutor for Moscow today. Here is an interview given to our correspondent by Lev Petrovich Baranov, the city prosecutor.

[Begin recording] [Correspondent] How do you assess the state of the fight against drug addiction today?

[Baranov] The state of affairs is extremely unsatisfactory. This worries both the Moscow party, gorkom and gorispolkom and of course it places a great responsibility upon law enforcement bodies. Take the program for combating drug addiction which was compiled and adopted in August this year. We see the problem, we know the causes, we map out organizational measures, we talk a lot, but there is little change in the practice of our work and in the results of our joint activity.

[Correspondent] On top of that one is seeing a growth in crime linked with drug addiction and the age of drug addicts getting younger.

[Baranov] Organizational negligence is the main fault here, you understand. Our checks indicate that in the rayons there is little success in uniting the efforts of all state and public organizations, those dealing with education, medicine, law-enforcement and so on; we must demand executive initiative and executive discipline. And from the viewpoint to raising the level of responsibility of all those who are connected with the fulfillment of the program, we also hope to solve the questions through the executive committees of the rayon soviets, the commissions for combating drunkenness, through the leaders of the law-enforcement bodies in every rayon, and at city level, too.

[Correspondent] Another question. You, personally, as the city's prosecutor, and the service that you head... what are the main complaints that you have to make, and against whom do you make them?

[Baranov] The establishments involved with education, of course. That is where everything begins. That is where it all takes place. And we see that there has been a weakening in the standpoint of discovering incipient drug addicts at an early stage, of early prevention at that level, the standpoint of having closer interaction between the educational establishments and the medical establishments, the family and the labor collectives. And of course there is a need for greater responsibility on the part of those in charge of the people's education, the head-teachers of schools: It is time to give up those methods of working by injunction in educational work—I am the teacher, you are the pupil, so please do as you are told. Those comrades are quite right who said that we have to go over to methods of elucidating the situation that prevails in the family, in the workplace of the young worker and the worker who is not of full age, and exert an influence on these via the enviroment, that is to say, ensure that influence is brought to bear individually, not rushing headlong at it, because at that age, of course, young people naturally resist, they assert themselves, and sometimes they do not respond to direct explanations based exclusively on moralizing.

[Correspondent] Serious complaints were voiced about the chief directorate for public health.

[Baranov] That is indeed true, because we see many problems connected with the activity of the city's public health department, first and foremost. In our view the norms covering the activity of the medical workers are to some extent set too high for a city like Moscow and they reduce the possibility of carrying out drug monitoring in the schools, in the vocational and technical colleges and so on. In other words there are not enough medical staff. Just take the following figure: there is just one doctor specializing in drug addiction for every 500 drug addicts.

[Correspondent] Can he really cope?

[Baranov] And a second point: The level of technical provision in the medical establishments cannot, as they say, stand up to any criticism. [end recording]

Racial 'Conflict' at Azerbaijani School

PM031623 [Editorial Report] Moscow *Komsomolskaya Pravda* in Russian on 1 December 1987 carries on page 2 under the headline "No Entry...to the Classroom!" a 1,400-word special correspondent A. Mursaliyev report from an unnamed town in the Azerbaijan SSR, where on 5 September this year a group of officers from the nearby military base entered the school, allegedly stating that "we do not want our children to sit alongside yours." Mursaliyev states that the "conflict" was quickly defused by the local party raykom and the "guilty parties were punished." He stresses that the source of the conflict was Russian parents' concern that Russian-language teaching in the area was not up to scratch and their children's education would suffer. Giving details of the educational aspects of the affair and noting a military spokesman's comment that town-base relations are "excellent," he goes on to note that "in the years of its existence the base has not become an organic part of the town" and concludes: "There is still smoldering discontent in conversations. The conflict may have been defused but the rumors continue."

Bribe Takers Sentenced in Volgograd

LD050041 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 2225 GMT 4 Dec

[Text] Moscow, 5 December (TASS)—A general who headed the militia in Volgograd Oblast, and his closest aides, have been condemned to long prison terms for bribe taking.

As *Krasnaya Zvezda* reported today, a group of persons, whose service duty was to fight criminals, covered up misappropriations at processing enterprises, for which they received generous bribes.

The open trial went on for more than 4 months. Former head of the oblast internal affairs administration Ivanov was sentenced to 10 years and his deputy Tyutyutov to 12 years deprivation of liberty. Two department heads at the internal affairs administration were also sentenced to long terms. The property acquired by the criminals was confiscated. The convicts must also refund the damage they caused to the enterprises.

Four Arrested in Refuznik Moscow Demonstration

AU071226 Paris AFP in English 1222 GMT 7 Dec 87

[Text] Moscow, Dec 7 (AFP)—Police arrested four Soviet "refuzniks" and dispersed others who tried to gather Monday morning outside the Communist Party Central Committee building in downtown Moscow to protest the authorities' refusal to grant them exit visas, according to a dissident source here.

Some 20 Jewish "refuzniks" had announced their intention to demonstrate Monday, but were prevented from leaving the nearest underground station by police who said the doors were closed for "technical reasons", according to Judith Ratner, a Jewish militant who received her exit visa last week.

At least two people were detained, including Aleksandr Feldman, a writer for a dissident review, and others were "dispersed" and went home, she said.

Police Sunday arrested 25 "refuzniks" who staged an unofficial demonstration outside the Foreign Ministry here and also detained a U.S. television reporter, participants said, while Soviet media attacked the protesters for "barging in" to a counter-demonstration called by authorities to mark the Washington summit.

Western reporters who had gathered to watch the demonstration saw about 200 people unexpectedly arriving in buses and carrying banners with pacifist slogans. The official counter-demonstration had not been previously announced.

Soviet television reported the incident as if the official rally, held to "wish success to the Washington summit" between U.S. President Ronald Reagan and Soviet leader Mikhail Gorbachev, had been organised first.

Correction to Ukrainian CP Examines Agro-Industry

The following correction pertains to the item headlined "Ukrainian Communists Examine Agro-Industry" published on page 71 of the 3 December Soviet Union *Daily Report*:

paragraph three, sentence three, reads: ... V. V. Kuyanov, V. I. Cherep, and V. G. Lysenko, deputy chairmen of the Ukrainian State Agro-Industrial Committee; and by Comrade V. D. Grevtsov, chief of the main administration of the committee... (supplying dropped "V. V. Kuyanov," correcting Grevtsov's title.)

Economic

CPSU Asks More Support for Cooperatives

PM011337 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 25 Nov 87 Second Edition p 1

[Unattributed report: "In the CPSU Central Committee. On Experience in Setting Up and Operating Cooperatives in the Sphere of Public Catering and Consumer Services for the Population, Consumer Goods Production, and Procurement and Processing of Secondary Raw Materials"]

[Text] A resolution adopted on the above question notes that,in fulfillment of party and government resolutions, party, soviet, and economic organs have launched work on the development of cooperative forms of activity. As of 1 October 1987, some 8,000 cooperatives had been set up in the country, employing a total of 88,000 persons. They have produced consumer goods and rendered services worth R135 million. The cooperatives render services to the population, engage in consumer goods production, and engage in developing their own fixed capital using funds they have earned.

At the same time, the resolution points out, the available opportunities for the development of cooperative forms of labor are not being fully used. Cooperatives still make an insignificant contribution to the supply of goods and services to the population. Their development is extremely uneven in territorial terms, and it is especially slow in the countryside. Some local soviet and economic organs display inertia and lack of initiative and are prejudiced against the very idea of setting up cooperatives.

Local soviets often allow red tape to obstruct the solution of questions concerning the provision of premises for cooperatives, the strengthening of their material and technical base, and the provision of raw materials and transportation, and they breach the timetables fixed for registering charters. They exert no influence on the determination of cooperatives' production orientation, even in the areas of housing maintenance and construction, the provision of services for equipping garden and subsidiary farm plots, and the purchase and processing of surplus agricultural products from the population, kolkhozes, and sovkhozes.

Many industrial ministries are proving slow to restructure their work, standing aside from this important work and failing to orient their subsidiary enterprises toward the creation of cooperatives.

The demand for setting up cooperatives, mainly from among citizens who are not engaged in social production, and for facilitating the manufacture of goods and the provision of services by cooperatives through the involvement of additional local food and material resources are not being met. Cooperatives are often allocated strict quotas of raw and other materials and food products at state prices. The cooperatives themselves are virtually uninvolved in the creation of raw material resources for their own production. There are still instances of cooperatives' making incorrect budget payments or breaching the regulations governing income distribution and price formation. There are cases of deviation from democratic principles in the management of cooperatives.

Local party committees do not perform sufficient organizational work on the development of cooperative activity, do not adequately monitor the work of local soviet and economic organs as regards the fulfillment of decisions adopted on the development of cooperatives, and delay setting up party and trade union organizations within cooperatives.

The CPSU Central Committee ordered union republic Communist Party central committees and councils of ministers, party kraykoms and obkoms, and local soviet and economic organs, in line with the CPSU Central Committee June (1987) Plenum demands, to adopt decisive measures ensuring the further development of cooperative forms of activity and the growth of their contribution to increasing commodity resources and services in every region.

It requested local ispolkoms to fundamentally improve the leadership of the cooperative movement, to efficiently solve any questions that may arise, and to strictly observe the established procedures governing the creation and activity of cooperatives, the development of democratic principles within them, and the observance of the principles of social justice. This must be perceived as a state task whose purpose is to satisfy, within the briefest possible time period, the population's needs for goods and services by the additional involvement in social production of primarily the non-employed section of the population and the utilization of local materials, agricultural products, and secondary raw materials.

It gave orders to eliminate the serious shortcomings and omissions existing in this work. Special attention must be given to the development of cooperatives in spheres of activity where there is an unsatisfied demand for goods and services. In this process, they ought not to replace but to supplement the network of state enterprises. The constant training of cooperative cadres must be ensured. The population must be better informed about the cooperatives' work.

More cooperatives must be set up in the leisure sphere and the provision of sports, health, and other services to the population.

USSR ministries and departments and union republic councils of ministers are set the task of stepping up work by the enterprises under their jurisdiction on the creation of cooperatives attached to them for the small-series production of consumer goods using production waste and local resources and the provision of various services to the population, and of handing over to them any premises, equipment, and transport facilities released in the process of transferring to multishift working.

The USSR Ministry of Finance, the USSR Gosplan, the USSR State Committee on Prices, the USSR State Committee for Labor and Social Problems, the USSR Ministry of Justice, the USSR MVD, and the USSR Prosecutor's Office are instructed to step up monitoring of cooperatives' economic operations. An end must be put to instances of defrauding the state, speculation, and incorrect income distribution. At the same time, there must be no encroachment on the rights vested in cooperatives.

Note was taken of the fact that the USSR Council of Ministers has instructed the USSR Ministry of Finance, with participation by other interested organizations, to improve the system of taxing the incomes of cooperatives and citizens working in them.

Union republic Communist Party central committees and party kraykoms, obkoms, gorkoms, and raykoms are instructed to step up their organizational work on implementing party and government decisions on the broad development of cooperative forms of activity, explaining their role in satisfying working people's requirements, eliminating all sorts of obstacles in the way of the creation of cooperatives, and stepping up the monitoring of their work. Leaders of soviet and economic organs must be held more responsible for this work, and there must be principled assessment of any instances of red tape, bureaucratism, and formalism.

The USSR State Committee for Television and Radio Broadcasting and the editorial offices of central, sector, and local newspapers are instructed to actively propagandize the socialist nature of the cooperative form of production and economic activity. There must be broader coverage of the practical work by cooperatives and their positive experience.

Efficacy of Foreign Economic Relations Defended

PM251121 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 20 Nov 87 Morning Edition p 5

[B. Pilyatskin "IZVESTIYA Interview" with O.F. Klimenko, secretary of the USSR State Committee for Foreign Economic Relations Party Committee: "Foreign Economic Ties: Commitments Must Be Fulfilled"; first two paragraphs are IZVESTIYA introduction; date of interview not given]

[Text] Ovchinnikovskaya Embankment, No 18/1—From morning to evening this building is a hive of activity: Automobiles come and go and the main entrance doors admit dozens of people. This is the headquarters of the USSR State Committee for Foreign Economic Relations. A sign on the fifth floor reads: "O.F. Klimenko, secretary of the State Committee for Foreign Economic Relations Party Committee."

Let us introduce our interlocutor to the readers. He is 49 years old and has worked in the State Committee for Foreign Economic Relations for more than 20 years, climbing the service ladder from ordinary engineer to deputy chairman of an all-union association. He is a graduate of the Academy of Foreign Trade and has worked in Egypt and Nigeria. He has been a member of the party committee since 1983 and its secretary since last year.

[Pilyatskin] Before I ask you the first question, Oleg Fedorovich, I want to explain to the readers the reasons for my choice of interlocutor. It is no secret that in past years our press only gave the status of foreign economic relations plus signs without making a profound analysis of problems, difficulties, and even mistakes. Times are changing and we are changing with them. This ancient saw is confirmed by our new approach to very varied phenomena of life, including in such a sphere of state activity as foreign economic relations, where the role of the human factor is particularly significant. For considerable material resources, money, and specialist work are invested in implementing a particular cooperation project, which all coalesces in the final analysis into a concept of our country's prestige and international reputation. Given all this, let us talk about ways and avenues of improving the mechanism for foreign economic relations. What does the State Committee for Foreign Economic Relations Party Committee secretary consider to be his main task today and what is the collective concentrating on?

[Klimenko] I'd like to remind you, first of all, that the party and the government have taken a number of fundamental decisions in the last year in the sphere of restructuring foreign economic relations. Why was this necessary? Because these relations in their existing form had ceased to meet the demands of the country's accelerated development.

If we are talking about the area of activity which the State Committee for Foreign Economic Relations is tackling, that is investment cooperation, its expansion is linked to the resolution of many tasks of export development, improvement of the export structure, and increasing the proportion of machinery and equipment in it. In addition, cooperation with socialist countries—our main partners,—developing countries, and other states is encountering difficult problems.

I will illustrate what I have said: It happens that, in order to finish equipping enterprises that are being constructed abroad with our help, we are forced to use equipment from Western countries which is in fact produced on the basis of Soviet scientific and technical developments. A serious obstacle in the way of expanding economic and technical cooperation is our country's limited choice of technology for small industrial enterprises and agrocomplexes. The point is that in many developing countries there is not always a demand for large-scale industrial equipment, because the creation of small and medium enterprises often remains a priority in the development of their industrial sphere.

[Pilyatskin] Uninformed people sometimes argue that the Soviet Union's ties with developing countries are tantamount to free aid. Some letters to *Izvestiya* this very day raise the question: What do these relations give the Soviet people and state, and are they beneficial?

[Klimenko] The disinterested nature of our cooperation means that our country sets no political or other conditions for or demands on its partners. Disinterested aid must not be confused with free aid, given as a gift. As a rule, the latter is associated with health, educational, and certain other projects. However, the overwhelming proportion of economic assistance is rendered for payment, with the principles of mutual advantage invariably observed.

Thus, in the last 5-year plan the USSR imported goods and output we needed that was worth more than R20 billion just from enterprises constructed with its assistance, in payment for current exports and for economic assistance given to developing countries. They included Afghan natural gas, Egyptian cotton thread, Guinean bauxites, oil from Iraq and Syria—the list could go on forever, to include many types of agricultural produce, including tea, coffee, fruit, vegetables, and also fish. Last year, cooperation projects accounted for more than 40% of all USSR imports from developing countries.

It is, of course, no simple task to step up the mutual advantages of our relations. But we are working on it and are seeking new forms of relations with partners. Thus we are studying the possibility of creating facilities in developing countries whose output will be supplied to the Soviet Union to meet the requirements of our industry and population. Talks are under way and agreements have already been signed on involving certain countries' construction organizations in erecting simple—in engineering terms—facilities in our country (tourist complexes, sports bases) and finishing work on hotels under construction and so on. This cooperation could be used, in particular, as a means of paying off Soviet credits granted to these countries. As you can see, there is value in foreign economic relations with developing countries, and it is considerable. I would characterize these relations as a mutually beneficial partnership.

[Pilyatskin] Could you quote figures, so as to provide an overall picture?

[Klimenko] In terms of the position at the beginning of 1987, the Soviet Union had interstate agreements on economic and technical cooperation with 72 developing states. They make provision for assistance in constructing more than 3,500 different projects, almost 2,200 of which have now been commissioned.

In many countries these projects have become leaders in the relevant sectors and have created additional sources of state budget revenue and export income. More than 500,000 local specialists and workers are now occupied at facilities constructed with Soviet aid. The USSR gives developing countries considerable help in training national cadres. More than 300 training centers, vocational-technical schools, and permanent courses have been constructed and equipped there, which have already enabled more than 600,000 qualified workers to be trained.

[Pilyatskin] Are there difficulties in the process of implementing an agreement?

[Klimenko] The USSR's foreign economic relations have not always developed smoothly. There are still difficulties now. They are primarily the result of a deterioration in the economic and currency-finance situation of young developing states and of imperialist attempts to destabilize progressive regimes.

Because of some of our partners' lack of funds, a number of facilities on which intergovernmental agreements have been signed have remained "lifeless." Sometimes they are constructed in fits and starts, but generally construction is deferred because of the revision of capital investment plans or the lack of secure working conditions for Soviet specialists. I will cite Angola, Iraq, and Afghanistan by way of examples.

[Pilyatskin] But, to be self-critical, our side is probably not completely above reproach in implementing cooperation projects. I know from my work as *Izvestiya* correspondent in Mozambique and other African countries that the right projects have not always been selected, outdated recommendations have been made, and sets of equipment and technology have sometimes been supplied incomplete or late....

[Klimenko] Yes, such cases do indeed take place. Construction schedule overrun applies not only to what happens in Siberia or in the Far East but also to foreign ties. Steps have now been taken to rectify this kind of situation. The resolution adopted recently to ensure unfailing fulfillment of all the USSR's international commitments arising from economic and technical cooperation agreements with friendly countries via the system of state orders and limits was directed toward this.

What I have said confirms the need to make very high demands on all personnel employed in the various elements of the foreign economic complex.

Cadre instruction and placement, that is everything which we associate with the concept of the human factor, is the most important area of work for the state committee's party committee. As is well-known, the existence at a certain period of "criticism-free zones" led not only to stagnation but also to moral degeneration in some personnel. This, unfortunately, also applied to the State Committee for Foreign Economic Relations. A number of persons occupying high posts, even at the level of foreign trade organization chiefs and economic advisers, were expelled from the party and several dozen were stripped of the right to work in the foreign economic relations system.

The CPSU Central Committee January (1987) Plenum once again stressed the inadmissibility of reducing demands on Communists, whatever sector they may work in. This instruction is now a key instruction in all party committee activity. Past mistakes and omissions must never be repeated.

One guarantee of this is the practice of electing leaders, right up to chairmen of all-union associations, which is becoming established in our cadre work. This year more than 20 officials have already been elected within the system of the State Committee for Foreign Economic Relations. This, in my opinion, reflects the spirit of the time, with its democratic changes and glasnost.

Experts Debate Price Reform Issues

PM241521 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 19 Nov 87 Morning Edition p 2

[E. Parkhomovskiy report under the "IZVESTIYA Round Table" rubric: "Goods, Prices, Us..."]

[Text] The CPSU Central Committee June Plenum discussed the upcoming reform of price-fixing and the need to bring retail prices into line with their actual production costs and spoke about the need for these questions to be widely discussed. Speaking in Murmansk recently, M.S. Gorbachev again stressed that such questions will not be resolved without broad discussion.

The upcoming price reform is arousing sharp public interest. This is shown by the letters coming into the editorial office, newspaper articles, and the conversations that take place in stores and on public transportation. People have questions to which there are no clear answers as yet.

The *Izvestiya* editorial office devoted a round-table discussion session to this topic. The following took part: A. Komin, first deputy chairman of the State Committee for Prices; N. Petrakov, corresponding member of the USSR Academy of Sciences; Doctor of Philosophy N. Alekseyev, department chief at the USSR Academy of Sciences Institute of Sociology; and *Izvestiya* readers, who were represented in the form of their opinions drawn from the editorial mailbag.

Extract from readers' letters:

"If glasnost really means glasnost, let us speak frankly about the upcoming increase in prices and do so armed with figures. This is too vital a question."

Petrakov: Let us agree right away that it is not a question of taking away from the population the sum of almost R60 billion that comes in the form of meat subsidies. It is a question of transferring this money to meat consumers through another channel. Many people lose sight of this. Why is it necessary to transfer this subsidy through an addition to salary rather than through purchase prices? Who receives these R60 billion now? We say: The population. But which social groups within it specifically? I can say that the money is being distributed unevenly. The highly-paid group within the population consumes more meat and milk products and a relatively smaller amount of potatoes, bread, and so forth. According to our calculations, the highly-paid group receives almost 3 times more subsidy per head of population than the low-paid.

Komin: The budget research statistics for families of workers and employees available to us show that a person receiving an average per capita income of R50 probably pays 20-30% more for meat than a person receiving an average per capita income of R150. This is probably due to the fact that people with a larger income have greater access to purchasing meat at the state price.

Alekseyev: I note the word "probably." But, for the most part, you treat this probability as a fact. Where are these calculations, when were they made?

Petrakov: The calculations are available; they are the budget statistics that the State Committee for Prices now offers us. The average purchase price paid per kilo of meat by the high-paid strata of the population is R2.9 (today in the stores, tomorrow in the market), while it is R4.2 for the low-paid and average-paid.

Extract from readers' letters:

"The principle of distribution of products must be combined with the principle of social justice.... This is most easily obtained by means of ration cards. And a second question; how much does the actual production of meat cost and why is there a subsidy at all? The high price of meat production is the price of slipshod work, the price of weight lost while animals wait to enter meat combines, it is the price of everything that is done any old way. We should talk not about shifting the payment for these disgraceful things onto others' shoulders but about overcoming this slipshod work and halving the price of meat. There are examples of this. The Central Committee June Plenum talked about this. It was a question of a prime cost of 95 kopeks per kilo of meat. Why are we thinking and talking about the present excessive prime cost as the basis for an economic increase in price, labor expenditure, and so forth? Let us consider who benefits most from state subsidy. There should be no state subsidy at all! Work must be carried out properly and prime cost brought down." Komin: There is no question at all of worsening the position of meat consumers. Prices must reunite production with the consumer or, more accurately, production with the market, but in our economic theory the market is generally spurned. The market and planning are regarded as diametrically opposed in our country. You can't introduce the new economic mechanism without the market and the main instrument of the market is price. It is the main source of information on expenditure and demand.

The present price system completely separates the producer and consumer. The kolkhoz member does indeed produce meat at exhorbitant cost but these costs have existed in our country for decades and to think that a host of "Arkhangelsk peasants" [reference to exemplary farming techniques practiced by a particular peasant from Arkhangelsk Oblast] will appear in a year or two or within the space of a 5-year plan and that costs will be halved is naive. One must take the prevailing realities of our agriculture into account. Yes, there is sluggishness and bad management. But I would not venture to say that these costs stem solely from bad management and that they should be two or three times lower today.

The system of retail prices that has taken shape today is unpromising for the state. It produces a deficit and empty shelves in food stores. If this system of prices is retained, these phenomena will merely be perpetuated. This very system leads us to inflation and monetary imbalance in the country. Because subsidies grow at a higher rate than national income.

One more important point. The increase in prices will take place openly. When this will be, it is difficult to say. We need a year just to prepare proposals. Then, when the issue is ready to be resolved, it will have to be discussed nationwide. It will then be stated by how much prices for meat, butter, and rye bread will be raised.

Extract from readers' letters:

"Will wages and pensions rise at the same time as prices? Will the increase in prices of products be balanced by a fall in the prices of industrial goods? What real guarantee is there that working people's living standards will not be affected?"

Komin: If possible, and we are striving for this, we will try to lower prices on certain industrial goods. We are not, of course, so naive as to make up for an increase in the price of foodstuffs by lowering the price of fur, jewelry, and automobiles. We are talking about everyday mass consumer goods like clothing, fabrics, and so forth.

I will say bluntly that the resources for reducing prices of these goods are few. So the main thing that will have to be discussed is how nevertheless to compensate for the increase in food prices. By what sort of monetary payments? How to do this so as not to affect people's living standards, particularly the low-paid, pensioners, and students? I think that people with low incomes even benefit from an increase in meat prices, since the addition to their wages that they receive will be higher than their loss from the price increase. Compensation will be effected by additions not only to wages but to grants, pensions, and other regular payments to the population from the state.

Petrakov: There are several different proposals as to how a potential increase may be compensated. There is a proposal for full and uniform compensation for all. A proposal to not compensate uniformly, with more than full compensation for the low-paid, full compensation for those on average wages, and only partial compensation for the highly paid. It has to be decided whether the size of compensation is to be applied to average wages or the average per capita income of a family. There is also a proposal whereby only those who have an average per capita income of below R100 per person will be fully compensated. Those who have a higher income here will either be partially compensated or not compensated at all. There can be other options too. The main thing is to take account of the principle of social justice. This should also be discussed nationwide.

The reserve available at the point of production must, of course, be mobilized. Examples of high labor productivity in stockraising and low prime cost of meat were cited at the June plenum.

Alekseyev: The main question here, in my opinion, is whether the increase in prices will lead to an increase in labor productivity. Whether it will halt the growth in unproductive costs.

Petrakov: Let us assume I am against increasing prices. Let us talk about R2 per kilo of meat. But then the prime cost must be reduced to 1R. Let us think about how to lower it. Make everyone "Arkhangelsk peasants"? Will we be able to do this quickly? No, we will not be able to!

Here, incidentally, prices are also culpable. The wild differentiation of purchase prices by zones! We have 74 zones for cattle and 80 for grain. What does this mean? It means that if there are high grain costs in Vologda, prices are fixed high. While low costs in the Kuban bring a lower price. A cost-based mechanism! But this hits specialization. Why grow corn at triple the price in the Vologda region? Let this production be concentrated in the grain-growing regions. But meat can and must be produced in the north. However, you need more than 1 year for this guide of reorientation. Let us think about how to change the pattern of production and regional specialization. This practice of cultivating crops and rearing animals outside their natural climatic zones must not be tolerated: It doesn't matter how much it costs, they say, we will cover the costs through the prices!

Then there are the losses in processing. True, we should be talking here, I think, not so much about losses as theft. There are, of course, quite considerable losses, and the main ones are are the hidden losses. Who would object if in a year or two the prime cost of meat was reduced not even down to 95 kopeks but to R1.5! Perhaps then it would not be necessary to increase prices. But, after all, there is no meat as such, there is frozen and fresh meat. There is prime meat, and there are bones. Formerly a chart of cuts of meat hung in butcher's shops but were then removed apparently to prevent butchers from making money by substituting cuts. As a result, who eats fillet today? Workers in the trade and privileged customers. Perhaps it is worth doing the following: Simply keep the standard of meat which we now have at R2 at that price and introduce a price differentiated according to grade. Fresh meat is not the same as deep-frozen or chilled meat. It is necessarry to discuss all this and seek...

Alekseyev: The proposed increase in prices is aimed at establishing proportions, creating favorable conditions for management, and getting people interested. But will this not lead to an even greater increase in production costs, slipshod work, and irresponsibility? Because the management mechanism in agriculture virtually does not change. I visited the "Kovrigno" kolkhoz near Moscow 2 weeks ago. It is in Naro-Fominskiy Rayon. You can't see much in a day but from my conversations with specialists I learned that the picture there is the same as it was 20 and 30 years ago. There is no gasoline, transport is at a standstill, the students sing songs and cook potatoes over camp fires, but no work is being done....

What will an increase in prices change in this situation.

Komin: The pattern which you have described does, of course, actually exist, no one disputes that. And these are the patterns that we want to get away from by creating the new economic mechanism. That is why the question of the reform of prices has assumed its full dimensions now, when we are switching over to methods of economic management and leaving administrative and command-based methods behind. The fate of the whole economic reform resides here, if you wish.

Alekseyev: In my opinion, the paramount task, given the prevailing prices and their imperfection, is to to bring the new economic mechanism into operation and set it running. And then we will be able too see what prices correspond to it and which do not. And then change them gradually. The prices are the consequence....

Komin (to Alekseyev): You, as a sociologist, have decided that prices are not an obstacle to a change in the economic mechanism. Whereas I, as an economist, can tell you that prices are today the basic obstacle in introducing new management methods.

Extract from readers' letters:

"How will the position regarding supplying the population with meat change if, on the one hand, prices are increased, while on the other, this increase is compensated for by a wage subsidy? What will change? There will simply be more money, which will pay for the same amount of meat. The price of coffee was considerably increased but you won't find it on sale.... Caviar rose inordinately in price, but where is it to be found? Will it not be the same with meat?"

Komin: The customer's idea about the value of a product will change, and this is the most important thing. Because when goods stand in a row on the store shelves and each has its own price, the customer's mentality and needs are molded in relation to those prices. We are molding these needs today on the basis of distorted prices. And are living, as it were, in a world of distorting mirrors. The customer's opinion about what to buy and what to save on must be molded the basis of realistic prices. This is where the point lies, not in the arithmetic.

Extract from readers' letters:

"We know that products are considerably more expensive in Western countries than in ours. But industrial goods here are considerably more expensive than there. It is primarily necessary to firmly establish a scientifically based living wage for a family. What range of products, items, services, cultural goods and amenities it must receive to live a normal life. And the price of products which are not in most stores must clearly be calculated on the basis of average market indicators. For some reason no one knows how we live or what we can buy with our wages today or will be able to in the future."

Komin: We know for sure that the average living wage will not change with the price rise. The point is that a new price system and new correlations are being formed. If a pair of shoes costing R120-130 at today's prices could pay for one person's annual meat consumption...

Alekseyev: ...Then this shows the exorbitant cost of shoes as well as the low cost of meat.

Komin: But it mainly shows abnormal price distortions. We must create the kind of price system which reflects real costs. Popular demand must be shaped solely within the context of these real costs. It goes without saying, of course, that the new price system will not be able to revolutionize our way of thinking in the very first year. It will be geared to the longer term.

From readers' letters:

"Will subsidies extend to deposits?"

Komin: I do not think they should. People do not save money to buy meat, milk, butter, and so forth. This money is intended for buying noncomestibles. The prices of these commodities will not be increased. As I have already said, we could possibly even reduce them....

The question of wages has gone virtually unmentioned. In our country they cling like a crab to low, subsidized food prices and these prices in turn pull wages down.... Everything must be linked. Low wages lie like a dead weight on technical progress. It is not to an enterprise's advantage to dismiss 5-10 workers and replace them with a machine. Because it is cheaper to pay them low wages. This is the crux of the matter! Consequently, we want to raise wages, regulate prices, and set everything on its feet.

Alekseyev: Raising prices is always a sign of economic difficulties and only a partial, temporary solution. We need to attain the kind of perfection whereby people look forward to their work, perform their duties to the best of their abilities, and are afraid to lose their job, as it is the source of a comfortable existence. We must create the kind of situation where everyone knows that the better he works, the more he will earn and that he will not only be able to keep up with inflation but also improve his standard of living. Unfortunately, at present workers and engineers in the material production sphere are unable to substantially increase their wages however hard they work. That is why, until this opportunity is made available to all working people in the national economy, retail prices must not be raised.

Petrakov: I think that it is up to the press to explain to the population that price rises are necessary and conduct a real discussion of the issues that have to be resolved in this respect.

From readers' letters:

"It is hard, of course, to come to terms with the idea of a possible price rise. But if the economy cannot be run realistically without it, this unpleasant task must be approached in order to simultaneously combating bad management and enormous, completely unwarranted losses and complying with the principles of social justice to the utmost."

This publication used letters from N. Lebedev from Leningrad, A. Chernyuk from Kamenka (Moldavia), I. Zatokovenko from Tashkent, S. Molnin from Kazan, N. Tkachenko from Zhdanov, and others.

From the editorial office: In view of public interest in the problems discussed at the round table, *Izvestiya* proposes to continue the discussion on improving price fixing.

Series on Foreign Economies To Appear

PM241445 Moscow SOTSIALISTICHESKAYA INDUSTRIYA in Russian 22 Nov 87 p 3

[Interview with Academician Ye. Primakov, director of the USSR Academy of Sciences World Economics and International Relations Institute, by Yu. Kirpichnikov, editor of SOTSIALISTICHESKAYA INDUSTRIYA's Foreign News Department, under the rubric "Business Club: Economics and Scientific and Technical Progress Abroad": "From the Treasury of World Experience"—place and date of interview not given; first paragraph is SOTSIALISTICHESKAYA INDUSTRIYA introduction]

[Text] Our readers' interest in the economies of foreign countries has risen sharply in the conditions of restructuring. It is necessary to have a realistic idea about those with whom we are doing business and those with whom we are engaged in economic competition. This dialectical view was typical of V.I. Lenin. The study of foreign experience and its use in the interests of the Soviet Union's national economy constitute a topical task. The *Sotsialisticheskaya Industriya* Editorial Board and the USSR Academy of Sciences World Economics and International Relations Institute today inaugurate the rubric "Business Club: Economics and Scientific and Technical Progress Abroad." The club's tasks and program are discussed by Academician Ye. Primakov, director of the USSR Academy of Sciences World Economics and International Relations Institute, and Yu. Kirpichnikov, editor of *Sotsialisticheskaya Industriya's* Foreign News Department.

[Kirpichnikov] Yevgeniy Maksimovich, one can fully understand *Sotsialisticheskaya Industriya's* interest in establishing permanent cooperation with the World Economics and International Relations Institute to explain various aspects of economic life and scientific and technical progress abroad. It is a pleasure that your institute so readily responded to this suggestion. But this type of work, to put it bluntly, is unusual for academic scientific research institutions. Could you say why you have taken it on?

[Primakov] One could mention numerous reasons, but perhaps the main one is the opportunity to get directly involved in practical work. We would like our work to produce specific benefits for the USSR national economy and to help solve the most complex problems of its restructuring.

We are studying the processes of the economic, scientific, technical, social, and political development of countries in the nonsocialist world. It is our duty to objectively analyze and be familiar with what is happening abroad. It would, however, be a mistake to limit ourselves to purely scientific studies. Cooperation with *Sotsialisticheskaya Industriya* will actually give us an opportunity to engage in direct dialogue with its millions of readers, with those who are directly involved in industrial production.

There is another fact which I personally consider to be highly important. It is no secret that until recently the Soviet press coverage of questions concerning economic life at home and abroad was highly biased: Everything here was good, everything there was bad.

We emphasize the differences in social systems and the criticism of capitalism and everything connected with it. This is perfectly understandable and fair. At the same time, it is obviously impossible to ignore the fact that the development of production forces occurs largely according to laws that are common to both capitalism and socialism. This common element stands out with particular clarity when we look at the organizational and technological aspects of the development of production, the labor process, and so on. And it is understandable that literally all countries, including capitalist countries, have their own achievements in the development of production forces. These achievements must be studied and used, of course bearing in mind the real differences in production relations and being unashamed to borrow anything that may be useful to us. We are certainly not talking about switching from excessive criticism to uncontrollable enthusiasm.

Incidentally, information on economic, scientific, and technical achievements in the West (I of course include Japan) would force our economic managers to give thought more often to the question of where and why we are lagging behind, and to take measures to overcome this lag. In other words, glasnost here can also perform its cleansing and mobilizing functions.

[Kirpichnikov] Yevgeniy Maksimovich, tell us briefly about the club's program.

[Primakov] We will try to tackle three groups of questions. First, the organization and management of production at firm and enterprise level. Problems, for example, like the organization of multishift work at enterprises, the assimilation of new production and technology, specialization and production sharing, forms of direct links between firms, the mechanism of collaboration between private capital firms and the state and banks, producer-consumer relationships, the quality and competitiveness of production, and so on. A description of these aspects of foreign economies would be particularly topical for the restructuring of our economic mechanism, the strengthening of enterprises' independence, and the development of economically accountable [khozraschetnyye] relations.

The second group of questions involves production efficiency and specific avenues of scientific and technical progress in various sectors of the economy. Here we will not restrict ourselves to analyzing the contemporary situation, but will also start publishing both forecasts and relevant foreign assessments of the future. They will also be of interest for current affairs.

Finally, it is necessary to publish articles of a general economic nature. Their purpose must be, on the one hand, to explain basic economic terms to the readers, but in close relationship with the problems encountered by our national economy.

[Kirpichnikov] Could you give some examples to illustrate your last idea?

[Primakov] Of course. For example, we increasingly often come across terms like gross domestic product, national income, and so on. But what does it mean, what goes into making up the indicators which measure the level of economic development? Would it not be interesting to look into all that? I believe that it would probably be a revelation for many people to learn that more than 50% of gross domestic product in developed capitalist countries originates in the so-called "nonproduction" sphere.

Or take the question of the quality of economic growth. Western economists are perfectly justified in holding that real changes in the economy cannot be assessed on the basis of traditional quantitative indicators in the conditions of fast structural changes and acceleration of scientific and technical progress. It is necessary to perceive what processes are actually concealed behind different growth rates. In other words, figuratively speaking, if a country has a low or even a zero growth rate but this is accompanied by reduction of obsolete, inefficient, and energy-intensive production units while firms are actively seeking and assimilating new, promising spheres for the application of capital, this is good. By contrast, fast rates accompanied by the retention of an inefficient economic structure which fails to meet the demands of scientific and technical progress can only lead to a buildup of crisis processes.

Surely this is an important issue for us? After all, many economic leaders still look at acceleration only as a matter of boosting purely quantitative indicators, disregarding the qualitative aspect. Even though it is well-known that it is better to produce just one sound article that satisfies the consumer than dozens of articles that no one wants.

Take also questions like the relationship between the state's taxation policy and the stimulation of individual initiative and enterprise, or the placement of state orders in conditions whereby there is interest in obtaining them, or the implementation of contract price practices in parallel with the creation of economic mechanisms limiting their inflationary growth.

[Kirpichnikov] Strange as it may seem, the questions which you mentioned did not include any comparisons or comparative analyses of our economy and foreign economies. Do you not deal with this issue?

[Primakov] You have touched on one of our most painful problems. We are, of course, trying to deal with it. But I must frankly say that, alas, we are simply not in a position to do much in this sphere. And the main cause, the main misfortune is the fact that Soviet economic statistics are extremely inadequate and often simply incapable of being compared with international economic statistics.

People in the West realized a long time ago that to engage in economic activity without well-organized statistical information that is available to the general public is like sailing the open seas without a compass. In a modern economy, and without comprehensive and detailed information, it is simply impossible to promptly and accurately diagnose economic problems, assess the advantages and efficiency of various production units and the competitiveness of production, correctly define the prospects of economic and scientific and technical progress, and make the best possible economic decisions.

Frankly speaking, I often think that some of our economic managers enjoy the inadequacy or departmental secrecy of statistics, insofar as it makes it possible to conceal incompetence and the results of unskillful activity and to evade glasnost, monitoring and critical comparison of their work by outside organizations, and adverse comparisons with world standards.

Let us hope that the measures recently adopted in our country to improve statistical work will radically change the situation. As for us, we will try as much as possible to inform the readers of the results of comparisons.

[Kirpichnikov] And one last question. What forms will the work of the "Business Club" take?

[Primakov] The word "club" as such presupposes several participants in the conversation. But I do believe that it would be a complex matter to organize a meaningful discussion within the framework of the space allocated to the rubric in the newspaper pages. Therefore, let us begin by publishing shorter articles by our specialists. It would be possible to organize either "roundtable discussions" or "club sessions" on major topics like, for example, resource savings. They will, of course, require more space. Generally, however, I feel that the form in which our material is presented ought to flexible and of interest to readers.

And we really do expect that *Sotsialisticheskaya Industriya's* readers will engage in a frank dialogue with us; we expect letters, questions, and suggestions.

Scientific

Launch of 'Cosmos-1899' Satellite Announced
LD071511 Moscow TASS in English 1509 GMT 7 Dec 87

[Text] Moscow December 7 TASS—The Soviet Union launched another satellite in the Cosmos series.

"Cosmos-1899" is carrying scientific equipment for continuing outer space exploration.

It was inserted into an orbiting path with the following parameters:

Initial period of revolution—89.3 minutes,

Maximum distance from earth (apogee)—297 kilometers,

Minimum distance (perigee)—126 kilometers,

Inclination—70.4 degrees.

Apart from the scientific equipment, the satellite has a radio system for taking precise readings of the orbit's parameters and a radio telemetry system for beaming data about the operation of the scientific equipment and instruments back to earth.

The on-board equipment is functioning normally. A coordinating-and-computing center is processing incoming information.

Third Chernobyl Unit Ready for Commissioning
LD041735 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1600 GMT 4 Dec 87

[Text] The third unit of the Chernobyl AES is ready to be commissioned. Power units one and two have been working to design capacity of 1 million kilowatts for over a year. The third unit is part of the second stage of the station and represents an element of a single technological system. At the time of the accident, a considerable part of the radio active pollution got here through the ventilation system and other technological channels. Not only important, complex deactivating operations and repair and reconstruction work were necessary but also scientific research. All equipment has been inspected and replaced in parts. A large volume of measures to raise nuclear and technical safety have been implemented. In standards of cleanliness, the majority of premises are practically identical to other operating power stations.

More on Third Reactor
LD041846 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1800 GMT 4 Dec 87

[Text] The third unit of the Chernobyl AES was started up today, with all necessary safety measures observed. As is known, it was badly damaged after the accident at the AES, and now the power unit, with a capacity of 1 million kilowatts, is back in operation alongside the first two reactors. Many months of heroic labor by workers, engineers, technicians, scientists, specialists, and Soviet Army servicemen went into bringing the unit back on line. In a very short period of time, they managed to carry out (?decontamination) and repair work, and overhauled and, where necessary, installed new equipment. The reactor's control and protection system is now more reliable.

All systems of the third unit are operating normally; we have no complaints or criticisms about it, a TASS correspondent was told by AES Director Umanets.

U.S., Soviet Space Study Conference Begins
LD071433 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1330 GMT 7 Dec 87

[Text] A conference of the joint Soviet-U.S. working group on the research into the solar system opened in Moscow today. It is being held in the framework of the USSR-U.S. agreement on cooperation in research into and peaceful use of space. The delegation consists of representatives of the Intercosmos Council of the USSR Academy of Science and the U.S. National Aeronautics and Space Administration, NASA, and leading Soviet and U.S. scientists.

The participants will discuss the coordination of scientific research and will exchange data obtained on the study of the planets of the solar system, particularly Mars and Venus, as well as cosmic dust, meteorites, and Moon rock. The agreement signed this April also envisages the participation of specialists of the two countries, by mutual accord, in a number of projects being implemented by the two sides.

It is noteworthy that the conference is taking place when Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee and U.S. President Ronald Reagan are meeting. This symbolizes the possibility for further cooperation between the two countries in studying and using space for peaceful ends.

Soviet Space Photography Draws U.S. Interest

LD071327 Moscow TASS in English 1324 GMT 7 Dec 87

[Text] Moscow December 7 TASS—More than fifty American organizations and companies have sent requests to the Soviet Foreign Trade Association Sojuzkarta for space photography materials. This was prompted by the uniquely high ground feature resolution of Soviet space photography materials (5-10 metres).

Vyacheslav Piskulin, general director of the association, has told a TASS correspondent that work has already been started to prepare space pictures of Antarctica for the U.S. Polar Research Institute.

A proposal by American oil and geological companies to set up a joint enterprise for the distribution of Soviet space photography materials in the United States is under study.

Interest in Soviet space pictures is being shown by such big organizations as the American Institute of Aeronautics and Astronautics, the Belka International Incorp, the Space Commerce Corporation, and others.

The Space Commerce Corp, with the participation of the NBC TV network, has shot a film on the activities of the Sojuzkarta to be shown in the United States.

An exhibition of Sojuzkarta products which will include space pictures of all continents of the earth will be held in the USA.